A COMPARISON OF THE FACTOR STRUCTURES OF THREE ASPECTS OF THE SEX ROLES OF WOMEN AND MEN

By

Barbara Bourne Rucker

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1979

To Lucien, who understood and helped,
and Michael, who was too young to
understand but loved me anyway.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A doctoral dissertation, while the prime concern of the candidate, is the combined effort of many people. I would like to thank some of the many who have helped me.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my committee chairperson, Dr. Larry Loesch, whose encouragement and friendship not only guided me through my doctoral program but also led me to acknowledge my interest in research.

Further thanks go to Dr. Wilson H. Guertin who helped kindle my interest in factor analysis and helped me to an understanding of its principles.

Dr. Joe Wittmer, also a member of my committee and my supervisor while a graduate assistant, has given me an understanding of and a liking for the administrative side of counselor education.

I would also like to acknowledge the knowledge and skills that all the members of the Department of Counselor Education have given me. I hope that I can pass on some of their effort.

My husband, Dr. Lucien Rucker, gave me assistance in understanding some of the math involved and put up with me on many a stormy night.

Heartfelt thanks go to Ms Marilyn Burt, fellow graduate student and friend, whose encouragement and assistance meant a lot to me, and to Ms Sue Rimmer, my gemini in interests.

Last, but not least, thanks go to the many women who have served as role models and sources of encouragement for me. I owe them much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vi

ABSTRACT xi

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION 1

- Background 1
- Purpose of the Study 2
- Rationale for the Study 3
- Definitions of Terms 4

CHAPTER II - REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 6

- Theories of Sex-Role Development 6
  - Social-Learning 6
  - Cognitive-Developmental 7
  - Summary 8
- Effects of Sex-Role Stereotyping 9
  - Introduction 9
  - Economic 9
  - Psychological 13
  - Socialization 15
  - Assessment 19
- Extent of Problem/Concern 21
  - Employment 21
  - Socialization 24
  - Politics 25
  - Religion 26
  - Language 27
  - Education 29
  - Summary 31
- Assessment of Sex-Role Stereotyping 33

CHAPTER III - METHODOLOGY 40

- Instrumentation 40
- Pilot Study 42
- Procedures for Study 44
  - Sampling Procedures 44
  - Data Collection 45

Page

Instrumentation 46
Analysis of Data 46
Limitations 49

CHAPTER IV - RESULTS 50

Introduction 50
Sample 50
Comparison of Sections of the Instrument by Sex 50
Women 50
Men 63
Women at Home 73
Men at Home 85
Women at Work 93
Men at Work 106
Summary 116

CHAPTER V - CONCLUSIONS 117

Introduction 117
Research Questions 117
General Findings 122
General Finding Number 1 123
General Finding Number 2 123
Recommendations for Applications of Findings 124
Recommendations for Further Study 126

REFERENCES 129

APPENDIX A - INFORMATION ON PILOT STUDY 134

APPENDIX B - FINAL INSTRUMENT 144

APPENDIX C - COMPLETE FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS 148

APPENDIX D - MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ITEMS ON THE FINAL INSTRUMENT 161

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 236

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1 UNEMPLOYED PERSONS AS OF FEBRUARY 1978 10

2 DEGREES AWARDED DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR 1975-76 29

3 DEGREES AWARDED DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR 1975-76 FOR THE STATE OF FLORIDA 30

4 DEGREES AWARDED DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR 1975-76 IN SELECTED DISCIPLINES 32

5 THE PERCENTAGES OF MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS IN THE STUDY SAMPLE AS COMPARED WITH THE UNIVERSITY POPULATION BY CLASS, MAJOR, AND RACE 51

6 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT _WOMEN_ AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 52

7 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT _WOMEN_ AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 55

8 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT _WOMEN_ AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 56

9 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT _WOMEN_ AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 59

10 COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT _WOMEN_ 60

11 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT _MEN_ AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 64

12 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT _MEN_ AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 66

List of Tables - Continued

Table Page

13 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 67

14 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 70

15 COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN 71

16 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 74

17 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 76

18 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 77

19 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 80

20 COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME 81

21 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 86

22 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 88

23 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 89

24 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 92

25 COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME 94

List of Tables - Continued

Table Page

26 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 96

27 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 99

28 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 100

29 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 103

30 COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK 104

31 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 107

32 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 110

33 FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 111

34 CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 113

35 COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK 114

36 BREAKDOWN OF SUBJECTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE PILOT STUDY BY SEX, CLASSIFICATION, RACE, AND AREA 135

37 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EACH ITEM ON INITIAL INSTRUMENT 136

List of Tables - Continued

Table Page

38 RELIABILITY DATA ON INITIAL INSTRUMENT - CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PRE-POST ADMINISTRATIONS 140

39 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 148

40 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 149

41 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 150

42 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 151

43 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 152

44 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 153

45 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 154

46 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 155

47 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 156

48 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 157

49 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS 158

List of Tables - Continued

Table Page

50 FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS 159

51 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ITEMS ON EACH SECTION OF THE INSTRUMENT BROKEN DOWN BY SEX BY YEAR IN COLLEGE, COLLEGE, AND RACE 161

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

A COMPARISON OF THE FACTOR STRUCTURES OF THREE ASPECTS OF THE SEX ROLES OF WOMEN AND MEN

By

Barbara Bourne Rucker

June 1979

Chairperson: Larry C. Loesch
Major Department: Counselor Education

The purpose of this study was to examine the factor structures of three different aspects of the sex roles of men and women and to determine if such structures are invariant across sex. The concepts examined were two general ones, Women and Men, and four specific ones, Women at Home, Men at Home, Women at Work, and Men at Work. The results of this study will assist in determining if men and women perceived these roles in a like manner. If they do not, the comparisons made between these two groups on a construct such as sex-role stereotyping could be invalid because any difference found could be due to variations in factor structure rather than differences in levels.

The study sample included 251 male and 250 female undergraduates below the age of 26 who were attending the University of Florida. A 25-item instrument utilizing the semantic differential technique was administered to these subjects during the Summer Quarter of 1978. A principal axis factor analytic solution was performed on the item intercorrelation matrices for each sex on each section of the instrument. A scree test was utilized to determine the actual number of

factors for each section after which these factors were rotated obliquely to simple structure. The number of factors differed between groups and between concepts. The factors were found to be moderately correlated.

None of the factor structures underlying the six sections were found to be invariant across sex. While many factors were common to both groups, the men consistently required more factors to explain the variance occurring in their responses. This variation in number of factors ranged from minimal for the sections _Men_ and _Women at Work_ to moderate for the sections _Women_ and _Men at Work_ to extreme for the sections _Women at Home_ and _Men at Home_. Inadequacy of instrument was suggested as an alternative hypothesis to actual difference in factor structure in the case of the sections having minimal differences. However, the consistent finding that the data of the male subjects produced more factors than did the data of the female subjects suggested that these men viewed the roles presented to them in a more complex manner and that they discriminated between aspects more than did the women in the sample.

A second finding was that both men and women generally considered the roles of women as related to the affective portion of their personalities while those of men were consistently viewed as potent in nature. There was some inconsistency in the way women viewed their role in the home as witness an ambivalence in the way the general sex-role item, Masculine-Feminine, loaded for female subjects on the section _Women at Home_.

Two different suggestions were offered for applying the knowledge gained in this study. The first pertained to counseling of clients and

suggested that counselors should be alert for clients who present a narrowness of focus about their sex roles and should help them understand and deal with this phenomenon. The second suggestion tied in with actual use of measurement devices and stated that counselors should make certain that the factor structure for any instrument used is invariant across groups before using it for purposes of comparison.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"Sex is the primary category for the classification of human beings . . . and divisions of roles by sex occurs to a greater or lesser extent in all social organizations, animal as well as human . . . (Westervelt, 1978, p. 11). Perhaps because of its very basic and obvious nature, the temptation to assign specific behaviors and expectations by sex has been almost irresistible. However, this division of roles has limited the ways in which men and women may fulfill the talents that they possess, leading to the phenomenon known as sex-role stereotyping. In order to effectively counteract this problem, an understanding of the perceptions men and women have of their roles must be reached on a basic, conceptual level. Only then can behavioral scientists develop possible interventions that will be based on a thorough understanding of the sex-role stereotyping phenomenon.

Background

Interest in the changing roles of women has gained prominence in recent years. Women are finding support for reevaluation of their roles from the women's movement, and they are demanding that their needs be considered.

> More recently . . . the women's movement has aroused consciousness of another set of injustices /other than those of minority racial-ethnic groups/ and again forced reexamination of previously unquestioned actions and beliefs. (Cole & Hanson, 1975, p. 3)

Women are reaching out, testing their limits and finding that these limits are either self-imposed or imposed by others. This has emboldened them to study their roles in the hope of finding their genesis and ways to broaden them. Men, too, are finding their roles restrictive and are trying to find new ways to express the more gentle emotions that have been forbidden by the expectations of their cultures.

Enlightened counselors, psychologists, educators, and sociologists are also lending support to this cause. Many in the helping professions are seeking ways to assist women and men to find new methods to realize their potential for growth. New techniques such as consciousness-raising and assertiveness training, traditionally used with women, have of late been used by men in an effort to widen the scope of their roles. However, while these methods have been successful, there is still much ground to be covered. To cope most effectively with sex-role stereotyping, a full understanding of its makeup must be realized.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to ascertain if the underlying factor structure of different conceptualizations of the sex roles of men and women is the same for both sexes. Specifically, the following concepts were examined for possible differences in factor structure:

Do men and women differ in their conceptualizations of the following terms:

1. Women
2. Men
3. Women at Home
4. Men at Home
5. Women at Work
6. Men at Work

Rationale for the Study

Most studies dealing with sex roles and sex-role stereotyping have assumed that the various roles of men and women mean the same to these subgroups and that it is necessary only to use a univariate test of difference such as the ANOVA or the t-test to determine if the groups differ on the strength of the measure used. This method of dealing with concepts does not take into account the possibility that the underlying structure of the concept may not be the same for all respondents, i.e. the concept "strength" may differ when applied to women than when applied to men. Therefore comparing the roles of men and women on a "strength" factor may lead to erroneous results.

An indication that the structure of some concepts may differ across criterion groups arose in a study by Guertin and Jourard (1962) where they found differing factor structures for males and females on a measure of self-concept. Eysenck and Eysenck (1969) reiterated the problem when they found that the primary factors identified from the use of common factor-analytic procedures on Cattell and Guilford's personality items were not invariant across sex.

In another study of invariance of factor structures across sex and race, Katzenmeyer and Stenner (1977) found structural differences between criterion groups on the Intermediate Level of the Self Observation Scales which would represent a threat to validity of inferences made from differences in mean score levels. This led them to conclude the fact that

> the difference in mean score levels between criterion groups may be due to differences in factor structure among the criterion groups, rather than to the treatment under investigation, /and/ is a rival hypothesis in any study in which the invariance between criterion groups is unknown. (p. 117)

In an earlier paper (1975) they stated that "demonstration of factor stability (invariance) is prerequisite to the legitimate use of such factors in scientific inquiry" (p. 27). Thus they recommend that invariance of psychological concepts across criterion groups not be assumed; it must be demonstrated.

As a consequence of the above, it appeared logical that the first step in determining whether men and women differ on a concept such as sex-role stereotyping would be to determine the underlying structure of the concept for both groups and to determine if these structures differ significantly. For this reason a study utilizing the semantic differential, a technique devised by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) for determining the meaning of specific concepts, was selected as the method for eliciting the meaning of certain sex-role stereotypes as they apply to different roles that men and women assume. Factor analysis of an instrument based on this technique, utilizing scales made up of common conceptualizations of sex-role stereotyping, should elicit the fundamental and meaningful dimensions of this concept (Cooley & Lohnes, 1971).

Definitions of Terms

To prevent problems with issues that are not pertinent to this study, the following set of definitions were used:

1. Sex - either of the two divisions or categories of organisms, female or male, based on the distinction of producing, respectively, egg cells or sperm cells (English & English, 1958, p. 497).

2. Sex role - the complex of behaviors usually considered by society as characteristic of or appropriate to persons occupying the male or female status and the attributed expectations concerning these behaviors.

3. Sex bias - "an opinion, either favorable or unfavorable, which Is formed without adequate reasons and is based upon what the bias holder assumes to be appropriate from the group in question" (Schlossberg & Peitrofesa, 1973, p. 44).

4. Sex-role stereotyping - "The highly consensual norms and beliefs about the differing characteristics of men and women" (Broverman, Broverman, & Clarkson, 1970, p. 1).

5. Sex discrimination - prejudicial treatment based upon a person's sex.

6. Sex-role development - the process by which a child develops into stereotypic behavior based on his or her sex by the expectations of his/her culture.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Theories of Sex-Role Development

Many theories have been advanced regarding the development of sex-role differences. While these differences are usually considered to be a combination of genetic and social factors, it is not considered pertinent to the purposes of this study to consider both aspects. An understanding of biological differences may be secured from any competent text on child development. However, social aspects are basic to the purpose of this study, and two different socio-development formulations are now presented.

Social-Learning

In terms of social-learning theory, Mischel (1966) states that sex-typed behaviors are an important concept and may be defined as "behaviors that typically elicit different rewards for one sex than for the other" (p. 56). Society tends to evaluate sex-related behaviors according to the degree to which these behaviors agree with social norms. Thus some behaviors are seen as appropriate for one sex and receive positive consequences while those for the other sex are seen as inappropriate and are negatively rewarded.

Sex-typing begins when the child learns to discriminate between sex-typed behavior patterns. Once this pattern has begun, the child then starts to generalize from specific experiences to new and different situations. Behavior that is perceived as appropriate to the child's sex is rewarded while cross-sex behavior is punished (Green, 1974).

The first step in the acquisition of sex-typed behavior comes from observations of the live models and symbolic models (i.e., films, television, books) to which the child is exposed. When a model is present, there is a strong positive correlation between the person's power and willingness to reward and his/her effectiveness as a model. However, children will imitate the behaviors of more than one model in varying degrees, thus preventing an exact duplication of one person. The child generally copies the model whose behavior leads to positive consequences rather than to negative ones.

Children are generally exposed to both male and female models. Thus the child acquires many behaviors from the repertoires of both sexes. If the same-sex model is perceived as the most powerful, then acceptable sex-typing occurs. However, cross-sex imitation will occur if the cross-sex model is the most powerful.

Thus social-learning theory postulates that sex-role acquisition follows the traditional learning theory principles of discrimination, generalization, observational learning, reward, punishment, and direct and vicarious conditioning.

Cognitive-Developmental

This theory assumes that "basic sexual attitudes are not patterned directly by either biological instincts or arbitrary cultural norms, but by the child's cognitive organization of his social world along sex-role dimensions" (Kohlberg, 1966, p. 82). Therefore the development of sex-role attitudes is based on the child's cognitive understanding of sex-role concepts and the importance they assume in his/her life. The emphasis is upon learning from observation of the behavior of others rather than on learning from reinforcement of responses.

As the child's cognitive understandings change with age, so do sex-role attitudes. These changes occur as a result of maturation of the cognitive processes. Kohlberg (1966) says of these changes that "the greatest individual variations in children's sex-role attitudes (within a given culture) are those related to age and to intellectual and social maturity" (p. 84). Parents affect the development of sex-roles by their attitudes rather than by any direct reinforcement process.

There are certain stages of development through which a child passes that are crucial to the proper formulation of a sex role. The development of normal adult sex-role attitudes appears to be contingent on having been socially assigned to a given sex before the age of three or four. Before this time the child's sex-role identification can readily be changed; however after this point such a change is difficult to make.

Once the decision has been made, the child begins to value those things connected with the sex he/she has chosen and begins to act consistently with that decision. Rather than assuming that behavior occurs, is rewarded, and then reoccurs, the cognitive-development theorist postulates that the child's sex role develops through stages as a result of maturation.

Summary

Two theories of sex-role development have been presented. One, the social-learning, postulates that behavior that is reinforced will tend to reoccur. Thus the child who is reinforced for being a boy will tend to repeat boy behaviors. The second, the cognitive-developmental, states that at a certain point in life a child makes a decision as to his/her sex. The child decides "I am a girl/boy; therefore I will value girl/boy things."

Effects of Sex-Role Stereotyping

Introduction

The theories previously presented converge on the reality that children reach the conclusion, whether cognitively or through reinforcement, that certain behaviors are acceptable for them if they are males and certain are appropriate if they are females. This stereotyping has led to negative consequences for both men and women, and some of these are presented below.

Economic

Most of the negative effects of sex-role stereotyping in the economic sphere have been on women. The two major areas underlying the economic sphere are employment and earnings, and each will be examined separately.

Employment. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor, women made up 41.4 percent of the total work force in February of 1978. However, they were significantly more highly represented than men in such areas as health workers (2:1); teachers other than college (2.5:1); retail (1.8:1); clerical (4:1) (in the sub-area stenographers, typists and secretaries, the ratio was 92.4:1); workers and private household workers (51:1). Men, on the other hand, predominated in such areas as professional and technical (2.8:1); managers and administrators (3.4:1); craft and kindred workers (19.4:1); and transport equipment operatives (12.5:1). The classification in which men and women were most equally represented is "nondurable goods manufacturing" where the ratio was 1.4 men to 1 woman. It can be seen that men and women are clustered in differing areas of employment with women more highly represented in areas that are helping in nature and men in positions that are supervisory or physical.

There are also disparities in the unemployment rates for men and women. In two out of three of the breakdown areas reported, women did better than men. However, the total effect was a higher unemployment rate for women. The figures for February 1978 are presented in Table I.

TABLE I

UNEMPLOYED PERSONS AS OF FEBRUARY 1978*
(16 years and over)

Classification	Number in Thousands		Rate	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Total	3,788	2,952	6.6	7.3
Married, spouse present	1,484	1,298	3.8	5.7
Widowed, divorced or separated	358	563	8.2	7.3
Single (never married)	1,945	1,091	14.6	12.3

*Source: Vol. 25, No. 3, Employment and Earnings, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics

In February of 1977, the proportion of males unemployed to females unemployed was 8.3 to 8.8 as compared to 6.6 to 7.3 for February 1978. While the overall unemployment rate has dropped for both men and women, it has dropped a little more for men.

It may be concluded that, in the area of employment, there are disparities between men and women, both in numbers employed and numbers unemployed. The sexes are unequally represented in the different areas of employment. That this separation is due to differing conceptualizations of the capabilities of men and women has been hypothesized by many authors (Brown, 1978; Fretz & Hayman, 1973; Wells, 1976).

Waldman and McEaddy stated the problem as follows: "Women, like men, find jobs in the fastest growing industries. However, no matter what industry women are in, they remain clustered in fewer occupation groups than men" (1974, p. 7). Specifically they wrote:

> 1. The service industry employs the largest number of working women. In 1970 as in 1940, most women in this industry were employed in professional-technical, service, and clerical-sales.
>   a. Service jobs: ones dominated by women are food services, practical nurses, and dental assistants.
>   b. Professional-technical: teachers in elementary and high school, registered nurses, social workers, librarians, dietitians, physical therapists, and dental hygienists are usually women whereas the more prestigious areas such as doctors, lawyers, and engineers have remained substantially male-intensive.
> 2. Trade - since 1940 there has been little change for women. They are salespersons, bookkeepers, cashiers, office machine operators, secretaries and typists. Women in eating and drinking establishments are mostly waitresses, cooks and clerical workers.
> 3. Manufacturing - in both 1940 and 1970 approximately 9 out of 10 women working in the manufacturing industry held semi-skilled operative or white-collar clerical jobs.
> 4. Government - of women employed by the Federal Government in 1970, most worked in nonprofessional administrative-clerical, and office service jobs. For women, 77 out of 100 (as compared with 44 of 100 men) were in grades GS-1 through GS-6. For the highest paid grades of GS-12 and above, 3 of 100 women were not comparable to the 23 out of 100 men. (pp. 7-8)

Earnings. Bradshaw and Stinson state:

> The weekly earnings of male household heads are substantially higher and have increased at a faster pace during the past eight years than the average earnings of all workers

> combined. The wide percentage gap between the earnings of men and women has changed very little . . . (Bradshaw & Stinson, 1975, p. 22).

For men 25 years and older, the median weekly earnings moved from $125 in 1967 to $219 in 1974, a change of 67.2 percent. For women in the same age group, the 1967 wage was $79 while the 1974 wage was $131, a change of 65.8 percent. Not only did women start at a lower salary, but by virtue of gaining at a lower rate, the gap has widened.

More specifically, Bradshaw and Stinson looked at women's earnings as a percent of men's and reported the following:

1. For professional and technical workers, women's salaries were 71.5 percent of that of men.
2. For managers and administrators, women's salaries were 58.8 percent of men's salaries.
3. For clerical workers, where women outnumber men 4 to 1, the women's salaries were 67.2 percent of men's salaries.

To illustrate the distribution of wages, Bradshaw and Stinson reported the following:

1. Of those making a weekly salary under $100, men represented 29.1 percent of the total and women, 71.0 percent.
2. Of those making a weekly salary between $100 and $299, men represented 66.3% and women, 33.7 percent.
3. Of those making $300 or more weekly, 94.0 percent were men and 6.0 percent were women.
4. Of those making $500 or more weekly, 96.0 percent were men and 4.0 percent were women.

Women were more highly represented in the lowest salary levels. However, as the level increased, women's representation decreased dramatically. Even adjusting for the fact that more men than women are presently in the work force, these figures are disproportionate.

In the economic sphere women have been particularly affected by sex-role stereotyping. They tend to be grouped in specific areas, and these areas tend to be the lower-status, lower-pay ones. Even when women occupy a high-status position, they are generally paid less than men are for the same work.

Psychological

The psychological effects of sex-role stereotyping are pervasive both for men and for women. The man or woman who deviates from his/her defined role often faces the possibility of sanctions from society. Conversely, equally heavy sanctions exist for those who do follow the dictates of society.

Amundsen (1977) reports that women are primarily oriented toward marriage and family, with expectations that they will be popular, desirable, marriageable and able and willing to bear children. For the woman whose talents, abilities and desires do not lie in this direction, he states that the result is "confusion, ambivalence, and emotional havoc." Further, there is also a "damaged self-image and a decline in self-respect among the vast majority who cannot transcend the narrow stereotypes of behavior proscribed for them" (p. 111).

The traditional helping professions have not totally fulfilled their obligations to women. In a 1970 study by Broverman et al., they found that both male and female clinicians' concepts of the mentally healthy male do not differ significantly from their concepts of the mentally healthy adult. However, there was a significant difference between their idea of the mentally healthy woman and the mentally healthy adult. Such a biased outlook forbodes ill for the women under their care.

In the 1975 Report of the Task Force on Sex Bias and Sex-Role Stereotyping in Psychotherapeutic Practice published by the American Psychological Association, the results of an open-ended questionnaire completed by women therapists on sex-role stereotyping or sex bias in psychotherapy with women are presented. From the answers submitted by these women professionals from the APA Divisions in Clinical Psychology, Counseling Psychology, Psychotherapy, and Psychology of Women, the following recurring themes were elicited:

1. The therapist assumes that problem resolution and self-actualization for women come from marriage or perfecting the role of wife.
2. The therapist lacks awareness and sensitivity to the woman client's career, work, and role diversity.
3. The female client's attitude toward childbearing and childrearing is viewed as a necessary index of her emotional maturity.
4. In family therapy or treatment of children, the therapist supports the idea that childbearing and thus the child's problems are solely the responsibility of the mother.
5. The therapist defers to the husband's needs in the conduct of the wife's treatment.
6. The therapist or colleague denies the adaptive and self-actualizing potential of assertiveness for female clients and fosters concepts of women as passive and dependent.
7. The therapist uses theoretical [formulations], e.g., masochism, to ignore or condone violence toward and victimization of women.
8. Sexist jokes and off-hand comments by the therapist have the effect of demeaning women.
9. The therapist employs inaccurate or demeaning labels (seductive, manipulative, histrionic, etc.) when describing female clients.
10. The therapist insists on Freudian interpretations.
11. The therapist maintains that vaginal orgasm is a prerequisite for emotional maturity and thus a goal of therapy.
12. The therapist labels assertiveness and ambition with the Freudian concept of "penis envy."
13. The therapist seduces the client.

14. Therapist has a double standard for male and female sexual activities.

15. The therapist heavily weights physical appearance in the selection of patients or in setting therapeutic goals. (pp. 1171-1173)

From these comments it may be concluded that the therapist a woman consults for assistance may reinforce the stereotype she may be attempting to escape.

The traditional role for men is contradictory and confusing on many points. Physical strength and accomplishment are considered the dominant images of men, yet intellectual and interpersonal achievements are most rewarded in men by society (Pleck, 1976.) For men the ambivalence about sex roles takes on a different aspect than it does for women. The direction and meaning of the change for women is evident, and the rewards tend to be obvious. The woman seeking change can look forward to an increase in self-esteem both from a psychological standpoint and from an economic one, if she so desires. The man, unless he is made aware of the possibilities, has to look forward to possible difficulties as he rises in his career because of governmental policies that require that opportunities for advancement be opened to women. To tell him that development of interpersonal and emotional skills will broaden his horizon may be difficult for him to accept.

The psychological damage caused by sex-role stereotyping affects both men and women. Although the difficulties each face are different, the problems are there and prevent the attainment of a gestalt of full psychological well-being.

Socialization

Even before they are born, children are differentiated as to sex. The active, kicking fetus is often thought of as a boy and the more quiet one is thought of as a girl. After birth, typically the first question parents ask is, "Is it a boy or a girl?" (Stone & Church, 1968). From the moment of the answer, many patterns of the child's life are seemingly set.

For the first six months after birth, boys receive more proximal behavior (touching, rocking, kissing, etc.) than do girls. After this period, however, there is a reversal and girls are generally embraced more throughout childhood. Also, from birth girls are generally looked at and talked to more than boys (Lewis, 1972). Thus even the initial physical interactions between child and parent often differ as a function of the child's sex. This continues the emerging pattern of sex differentiation that began at birth.

The sex of the young child is not readily apparent when clothed. Parents, however, often dress their little girls in soft, ruffled clothes (often pink) while boys sport their identifying blue color in firm, crisp fabrics that are intended to stand up under the wear and tear the "more active" sex is expected to give them (Oakley, 1972; Stone & Church, 1968). The world thereafter generally has no problem identifying and correctly responding to the child's sex.

As they grow, most boys are directed toward active toys such as guns, baseballs and footballs, and they are taught that they are to play with only those toys considered appropriate for their sex. Many girls are urged to play with dolls and to make themselves as much like "Mommie" as possible (Stone & Church, 1968). Children are often being taught to practice the roles they will be expected to assume when they are adults.

After the family has begun the socialization process, the child enters the school where sex-role stereotypes continue to be reinforced. "Sexism starts with kindergarten activities in which little girls are directed to the housekeeping corner, while boys are steered toward blocks and trucks" (Bernstein, 1972, p. 98). Most teachers tend to reinforce docile, conforming, passive behavior because this makes the child easier to work with in the classroom setting. For girls, this expectation usually builds on previous behavior patterns and continues what has already begun. However, for boys this often causes confusion for, while the school demands docility, society expects aggressiveness (Lee, 1976; Levy, 1972; McCune & Mathews, 1976). This is an example of the early effects of sex-role stereotyping.

In secondary schools stereotyping may be even more direct. Boys are encouraged by parents, teachers, and peers to enter math and science courses which are the bases of many of the technical occupation fields. Such competencies are usually seen as inappropriate for girls. Meanwhile many counselors tend to reinforce these ideas by guiding girls into traditional "feminine" occupations such as nursing or teaching (Bernstein, 1972; Levy, 1972; McCune & Mathews, 1976). Thus boys are often pressed toward college while girls are directed toward "homemaking." While this trend appears to be changing, the change is by no means complete. Consequently, the behaviors of both sexes are often highly influenced by their school experiences, and unfortunately these experiences typically reinforce stereotypic behaviors.

While the reinforcement of behaviors by adults in the school continues, the reading material the children are exposed to often adds to the stereotyping. Females in textbooks are generally portrayed as passive and are defined primarily by their relationships with males while boys are seldom seen in the nurturing roles that would give their male readers an understanding of the possibility of a more gentle behavior (McCune & Mathews, 1976).

Stewig and Higgs (1973) reviewed children's books and found that women were usually presented in highly stereotypic ways. "Mother" was usually pictured by the stove or rocking the cradle while "Father" was busy at his job away from the home. They replicated this study in 1976 and found that while "Mother" was finally out of the home, the range of behaviors in which she engaged was still relatively narrow. Women were still in subordinate positions in the home more often than in active, outgoing roles in the community. Even the "homemaking roles" were "neither intellectual nor creative" (p. 153). Hillman compared the occupational roles in children's literature for the years 1932, 1935, and 1938 and again for the years 1965, 1968, and 1971 and found little difference between the two periods. As she stated: "Women have not been depicted in a variety of occupational roles, and this situation seems to have changed very little in the past thirty years (Hillman, 1976, p. 3). While the trend in reading materials appears to be changing somewhat, the change is not yet sufficient to disallow stereotyping.

The structure and organization of schools often transmit sex-role stereotypes to its students. For example, McCune and Mathews found that 83 percent of the instructional staff in elementary schools are female yet only 14 percent are principals. The figures at the secondary level are even more unbalanced than those of the elementary schools at 49 percent and 2 percent, respectively. The school structure tends to reinforce the idea that men are "authoritative" figures while women are subordinates.

In the adult world, socially, the wife's identity is often determined by that of her husband. In the traditional wedding ceremony, the bride is given away by her father, and she and her husband become as one, with that one being the husband. Thus, until she is married, a woman is subordinate to her father; after marriage, she is expected to submerge herself into her husband, even assuming his name. The woman is seen as the helpmate to the man, and her needs are usually secondary to those of her husband. She keeps his house, raises his children, and is expected to find some method to fill the void when the children are gone and no longer need her. The resulting identity crisis takes its toll both mentally and physically, and the woman often becomes deeply depressed by her situation.

The social world of the man is generally defined by his career. He is usually expected to make friends among his co-workers because they can help him achieve success in his profession. He has little time to spend with his family because he is too busy fulfilling the demands made upon him by his career. When he finally reaches a point where his career is established and he has more time to devote to home and family, he often finds that his family has made other plans in their lives that do not include him. He, too, reaches a point of crisis in his life where he is unsure of where life has taken him (Brenton, 1966).

Assessment

Many assessment tools, most notably interest inventories, help to narrow the range of vocational opportunities because of the limited options their results present to both sexes. The report Issues of Sex

Bias and Sex Fairness in Career Interest Measurement (sponsored by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1975) states that sex bias exists in these instruments in the choice of items, in the norming process, and in the sexist wording (e.g. mailman, saleslady). Furthermore the basic premises upon which interest inventories are built lead to bias. For example, the people-similarity method used in some instruments assumes that people in the same job have similar characteristics, similar likes and dislikes. It relies heavily upon the "status quo" of the society and allows little help to men and women to break out of the roles that have seemingly been "set" for them. Similarly, the activity-similarity method implies that if people like activities similar to the activities required by a job, they will like those job activities and consequently will be satisfied. This type of inventory, relying on people's liking or disliking common activities similar to those required on jobs, yields scales that are based on people already in occupations. This tends to perpetuate the sexual imbalance already present in many areas of employment and there is little chance for crossover into different areas.

For women these two developmental conceptualizations have often caused special problems.

> Interest measurement has been predominantly developed by, for, and about men. Conceptions of interests have been largely based on data about men's interests; interest-measurement methodology has arisen out of interest measures on men; and interest measures have been validated on men. (Cole & Hanson, 1975, p. 8)

It is questionable whether instruments so basically biased can sufficiently fulfill the vocational counseling needs of women.

Extent of Problem/Concern

Sex-role stereotyping enters all phases of human life with no area remaining free of its effects. It is the purpose of this section to examine some of these areas although no pretense is made that all matters touching the lives of men and women will be covered.

Employment

Specific statistics concerning the effects of sex-role stereotyping in employment were covered in an earlier section of this chapter. It is proposed to elaborate upon the subject in this section.

Although women are represented in all occupations, they are more highly concentrated in clerical and "low-level jobs." Even those in professional and technical occupations are generally nurses or elementary school teachers. Theodora Wells sees the problem as all-pervasive and says of the working world: "Sexism . . . is a primary factor in determining most decisions about virtually all aspects of employment" (1976, p. 119). She postulates the following as indicators of organizational sexism:

1. Sex typing of jobs. Most jobs are predominantly held by one sex.
2. Different entry jobs for men and women.
3. The invisible ceiling. This is the job level where one woman appears, with few women or none at higher levels.
4. Different meanings of "qualified."
5. Different rates of promotion.
6. Different supports while "proving yourself."
7. Different access to training and development.
8. Tokenism. (p. 120)

These stumbling-blocks help to keep women from attaining higher positions in management, thus effectively keeping them from helping other women as both role models and power bases.

One area where women are particularly under-represented is the business world. Rosen and Jerdee (1974) postulated that male managers do not intentionally give favored treatment to men; they do it automatically, without thought. However these subtle forms of differential treatment could have an important cumulative impact on the self-image and career progress of women. A survey of 1,500 Harvard Business Review subscribers utilizing a questionnaire designed to sample executive decision-making by choosing between alternative courses yielded the following conclusions:

1. Managers expect male employees to give top priority to their jobs when career demands and family obligations conflict. They expect female employees to sacrifice their careers for family responsibilities.

2. If personal conduct threatens an employee's job, managers make greater efforts to retain a valuable male employee than the equally qualified female.

3. In selection, promotion, and career-development decisions, managers are biased in favor of males.

They found that the responses reflected two general patterns. One, there is greater organizational concern for the careers of men than there is for those of women, and two, there is a degree of skepticism about women's abilities to balance work and family demands. One positive fact emerged: even though managers tend to fall back on stereotypes when information is scant; when full information is given, more consideration is given to fairness.

In a 1973 survey Boyle found that many companies had not made a substantial commitment to upgrade women. This conclusion was reiterated by

Hennig and Jardim in 1976. They also stated that women tend to be unequated with the informal rules of business behavior that men take for granted. This can make the day-to-day interactions that integrate employees into the corporate system more difficult for women.

Reporting the rules of the progress women have made toward equal employment opportunity (EEO) for women, Fretz and Hayman (1973) stated:

> Despite the government's dicta, and despite the passion, rhetoric, and emotion supporting EEO for women, persuading many businesses to judge female managerial candidates in the same light as they do males is far from accomplished. (p. 133)

In a survey of 20 business organizations, they found that:

1. Cultural conditioning is hard to break through. Male managers find it hard to accept women, and women themselves have preconceived notions of what their role should be.

2. Companies place higher value on profits than on their equal opportunity commitments.

3. Government, which has made costly demands and criticized rather than offered constructive help, has seemingly decreased rather than increased management support for female equal opportunity.

4. At present the labor market is large so women are not in demand.

5. Nobody really knows what has to be done to end discrimination.

All of these factors result in the following:

1. Individual male managers' biases keep females' salaries below, or in the lower part of, the applicable salary range for the position.

2. Dead-end "female" jobs.

3. Females are excluded from bonus groups.

4. The lower pay levels are traditionally offered to females in the marketplace.

Socialization

Socialization has led to stereotypes being attributed to the sexes. Men are considered as "made of":

> independence, aggression, competitiveness, innovation, self-discipline, stoicism, activity, objectivity, analytical-mindedness, courage, unsentimentality, rationality, confidence, and emotional control. (Bardwick & Douvan, 1971, p. 225)

Women, however, are "made of":

> dependence, passivity, fragility, low pain tolerance, non-aggression, noncompetitiveness, inner orientation, interpersonal orientation, empathy, sensivity, nurturance, subjectivity, intuitiveness, yieldingness, receptivity, inability to risk, emotional liability, and supportiveness. (Bardwick & Douvan, 1971, p. 225)

Several reasons are given for the causes of these differing expectations. As young children girls are permitted a wide range of acceptable behaviors (tomboy to very feminine) whereas boys are permitted to be neither "sissy" nor outwardly aggressive. This leads girls to maintain dependence on adults for approval while boys must learn to look within themselves.

Boys are pressured early to give up childish behaviors because they are perceived as feminine by parents. Thus they must earn their masculinity early. Girls, however, are permitted to drift along and are not pressed to begin a search for identity. The results of these factors are self-dependence for men and other-dependence for women.

The present trend toward changes in women's roles has resulted in a call for changes in the roles of men. This change from traditional masculinity, where interpersonal and emotional skills are relatively undeveloped and feelings of tenderness and vulnerability are particularly prohibited, to modern masculinity, where interpersonal skills are expected and emotional calm is highly valued, has caused problems for some men (Komarovsky, 1974; Pleck, 1976). Their basic relationship with women must be changed to accommodate the change in women's roles. Women are demanding equality both at work and in the home, and the changes can be far-reaching.

Another area which arises but which has been dealt with very little is the change in the relationship between men. Whereas in the traditional role men had strong emotional bonds to other men, the modern man shares his confidences and dreams with women (Kamarovsky, 1974; Pleck, 1976). Unless men are prepared to deal with these changes, severe conflict can arise.

Politics

Women's roles in politics have traditionally been that of "envelope-stuffers." They usually carry out the clerical duties and attend political rallies to lend support to male candidates. In 1976 this translated into 417 male members of the U. S. House of Representatives and only 19 Congresswomen. In the Senate the figures are 99 to 1. If the figures were proportional to the number of eligible voters, the ratios would be 220 Congresswomen to 216 Congressmen and 51 female senators to 49 male senators (Amundsen, 1977). Women are dependent on a Congress that is predominantly male and that has exempted itself from the non-discrimination policies it has imposed on the rest of the population.

Women are extremely underrepresented in numbers at all levels of government. For a "minority" that contains 51 percent of the population, women have never had a major party female candidate for the office of President of the United States. In all only 12 women have served in the U. S. Senate since 1920, and most of these were widows of previous office holders (Amundsen, 1977). For members of the House of Representatives, the numbers have been little better, but at no time has the proportion approached the 51 percent to 49 percent representation that would hold were the numbers according to the population. No woman has yet been selected to serve on the Supreme Court.

There were three women governors from 1924 to 1968. One of them ran for office because her husband had been impeached and thus was disqualified from running for office. She ran in his stead. In Alabama where state law prevented George Wallace from succeeding himself, his wife ran on a platform which made it clear that he intended to run the state in her name. The third woman ran as the widow of the previous governor and, although she did no campaigning, she was elected out of respect for her widowed status (Amundsen, 1977). Since these examples, however, women have successfully run for and been elected as governor in their own right, perhaps indicating a change in both candidates and voters.

On the local level, matters are worse. In 1975, out of 17,000 elected county commissioners, only 400 were women. These figures are somewhat improved at the city level; out of 134,000 city councilpersons in 1974, 4,400 were women. For the post of school board member, women accounted for 9.7 percent of the positions (Amundsen, 1977).

The very basis of the American system and the pattern for change is the political system. If women are to participate they must be fully represented.

Religion

Christian religious also have long espoused firm ideas of the roles of men and women. For example, while the Episcopal Church now permits the ordination of women, there has been little change in attitudes about the roles of men and women since the Christian religion was founded nearly 2,000 years ago. In the Bible, the Apostle Paul laid out the Christian doctrine as it pertains to the relationships between men and women in First Corinthians 11, verses 2-9. He states:

> . . . the head of every _man_ is _Christ_; but the head of the woman is the man . . . /the _man_/ is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. For the man was not created for the woman but the woman for the man.

"Good" Christian men and women are expected to accept the ideas without question and to live by them. This narrow definition of their relationships provides little room for growth or change.

Language

"Language and the social value attached to certain words have a subtle, powerful effect in forming attitudes and behaviors" (Loring & Wells, 1972, p. 89). The basis of human thought is a language which expresses the ideas of the dominant group of the culture from which it arises (Strainchamps, 1971). She says of the English language that although

> . . . one of the most highly evolved of the world's hundreds of languages and the _one_ spoken in the most thoroughly technological society, /_it_/ retains more vestiges of the archaic sexual attitudes than any other civilized tongue. (Strainchamps, 1971, p. 348)

Lakoff (1974) mentions problems of syntax as one of the "gender-related peculiarities of speech" (p. 65) that serve to separate the sexes. One particular form that is most often used by women is the tag question, midway between an outright statement and a question, being less assertive than the former but more confident than the latter. The general impression that arises from the tag question is that the speaker is unsure.

Often words have counterparts for each sex, i.e. master/mistress, bachelor/spinster. When the meanings of these words are examined, there is often a positive or at least a neutral connotation for the masculine form. Its feminine counterpart, however, is often associated with negative thoughts or feelings.

The use of euphemisms in the English language often has the effect of lowering the role of women. Rather than use the term "woman," many often substitute the word "girl." According to Webster a girl is a "young, female child." In the American culture a "young, female child" may be as old as 80 years or even older. The term "boy" was once used as a particularly derogatory euphemism for black males meant mainly to keep them in a subordinate position. To use such a term today would be looked upon as a vestige of barbarism by cultured society.

Many organizations such as the American Psychological Association have concluded that the sexist use of language is sufficiently important that it should be investigated and dealt with. As a result of such a study, the APA "Guidelines for Nonsexist Use of Language" was issued in 1974. These guidelines have been adopted by various journals in the counseling field because of the recognition of the importance of the issue.

Perhaps the difficulties that arise with language in terms of sexuality come from the consideration that this separativeness is "natural" (Pierce, 1971). Until such time as women are accepted as the equals of men, the devisiveness of the language will continue (Strainchamps, 1971).

Education

The effects of sex-role stereotyping in the schools were covered in an earlier part of this paper. It is now intended to examine this phenomenon at the college level. It is proposed to present information concerning the prevalence of men and of women in different areas and at different levels of college.

Table 2 presents the percent of college degrees presented to men and women at different degree levels during the year 1975-76:

TABLE 2

DEGREES AWARDED DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR 1975-76*

Level of Degree	% Men	% Women
All levels	56	44
Bachelor's degree	54	46
**First-professional degree	84	16
Master's degree	54	46
Doctor's degree	77	23

*Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Education Division, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

**Requires at least six years

It is clear from these figures that women tend to be underrepresented at all levels. Although the percentages are not greatly disproportional at the bachelor's level, this changes as the level rises. Men are much more highly represented in terms of first-professional degrees. The balance appears better at the master's degree level;

however, over half of the master's degrees granted to women were in the area of education, an area where women are usually more highly represented. For doctor's degrees, the ratio is over three to one in favor of men.

Women have shown a larger percentage of increase at all levels from 1974-75 to 1975-76. The greatest gain was at the first-professional degree level where the rate of increase for women was 40.1 percent whereas for men it was 8.1 percent. Men actually showed a decline (2.0 percent) in doctoral degrees conferred from 1974-75 to 1975-76; women, however, increased at a rate of 7.4 percent. The gains for women were not sufficient to bring them in line with men, but they may indicate a positive trend.

For the state of Florida, the percentages are given in Table 3.

TABLE 3

DEGREES AWARDED DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR 1975-76
FOR THE STATE OF FLORIDA*

Level of Degree	% Men	% Women
All levels	57.8	42.2
Bachelor's degree	57.3	42.7
First-professional degree	85.1	15.9
Master's degree	51.8	48.2
Doctor's degree	76.5	23.5

*Source: NCES 77-322, National Center for Education Statistics
Education Division, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

The percentages for selected disciplines are presented in Table 4. These figures indicate that men and women generally tend to be more highly clustered in different areas at the bachelor's level. Women are in such disciplines as education, fine and applied arts, foreign languages, health professions, and home economics. Men are more highly represented in such areas as engineering, law, and mathematics.

At the master's level, the proportions begin to shift in most areas in favor of men. At the doctoral level, men outnumber women in terms of degrees received in almost every discipline, even in those in which women greatly outnumbered men at the bachelor's level. The one exception is home economics.

It is apparent from the statistics presented here that men and women were not equally represented at the different levels of college in the year 1975-76. The imbalance was most noticeable at the higher degree levels. In terms of disciplines, women tended to be most highly represented in the social science and home-making areas; men, however, tend to be more in the theoretical and applied "hard" sciences. This disparity can lead to job inequities later because the areas that men tend to be grouped in generally are those that are in demand and are higher salaried while women are in the lower-salaried positions.

Summary

The inequities created by sex-role stereotyping reach into all areas of society and affect the lives of most men and women. Efforts to assess this problem have led to the development of different instruments used for measurement. An examination of the most prominent of these follows.

TABLE 4

DEGREES AWARDED DURING THE SCHOOL YEAR 1975-76 IN SELECTED DISCIPLINES*

Discipline	% Men	% Women	% Men	% Women	% Men	% Women
Education	27.2	72.8	36.7	64.3	66.6	33.4
Engineering	96.8	3.2	96.4	3.6	97.7	2.3
Fine and Applied Arts	39.1	60.9	51.1	48.9	72.1	27.9
Foreign Languages	23.6	76.4	33.3	66.7	52.1	47.9
Health Professions	21.2	78.8	33.5	66.5	71.2	28.8
Home Economics	4.1	95.6	8.5	91.5	28.7	71.3
Law	81.2	18.8	88.0	12.0	89.0	11.0
Mathematics	59.3	40.7	66.0	34.0	89.0	11.0
Psychology	45.6	54.4	53.3	46.7	68.3	31.7
Social Sciences	62.1	37.9	68.4	31.6	78.4	21.6

*Source: NCES 77-322, National Center for Education Statistics, Education Division, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Assessment of Sex-Role Stereotyping

The previous sections presented the problems that have resulted from sex-role stereotyping. Realization of the extent of these difficulties and their seriousness has caused research into an understanding of this social phenomenon. The remainder of this chapter will consider assessment of sex-role stereotyping and various instruments used for this purpose.

Broverman et al. (1972) developed the Sex-Role Questionnaire to measure sex-role perceptions by determining the degree to which men and women are perceived to possess any particular trait. A total of 122 items was put into bipolar form with a scale spread of 60 points. Those items on which at least 75 percent agreement among subjects of both sexes existed as to which pole was more descriptive of the average man than the average woman, or vice versa, were termed "stereotypic." When the agreement as to which pole was masculine and which feminine was less than 75 percent but was still high, the items were termed "differentiative." Any other item was "nondifferentiative." No total score or factor scores were utilized as an indicator to the person filling out the instrument of his/her standing on the subject of sex-role stereotyping. Instead the authors wished to determine if stereotypes did exist and in what manner they existed. They concluded that "high consensuality about the differing characteristics of men and women was found on a considerable number of items, and this was independent of age, sex, religion, education level, or marital status" (Broverman, et al., 1972, p. 65).

Another instrument that has resulted from the study of the relationships of men and women is the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) which was designed to differentiate subjects on a measure of androgyny. The BSRI contains 20 masculine and 20 feminine personality characteristics as well as 20 items that are neutral in nature and are not used in scoring the instrument. The original scoring system characterized the taker as either masculine, feminine, or androgynous by running a Student's t ratio for the difference between the score on the masculine adjectives and the score on the feminine adjectives. The resulting t ratio was the index of androgyny (Bem, 1974). This scoring system presented problems as the Student's t is properly run between uncorrelated subjects whereas the two scores to be compared on the BSRI were on the same individual, i.e. correlated subjects. Most properly a correlated t ratio should have been used.

Gaudreau (1976) factor analyzed the Bem Sex-Role Inventory using the 20 masculine traits, 20 feminine traits, 20 neutral traits, sex of subject, femininity score, masculinity score and androgyny score as variables. She found four factors which were defined as (1) masculinity, (2) femininity, (3) sex of subject, and (4) "mature" neutral. The masculine factor included 17 of the 20 masculine adjectives from the inventory, i.e. "strong personality," "assertive," and "dominant," most of which generally pertain to potency. Such items as "sympathetic" and "compassionate" loaded most heavily on the feminine factor indicating a tendency to identify this area with the affective side of the personality. The third factor, sex of subject, was loaded most heavily by the "masculine" and "feminine" items from the inventory. The "mature" neutral factor had such items as "reliable," "sincere," and "truthful" as its primary components.

Some questions arise about the methodology used in this study. The inclusion of the 20 items that are not used in the actual scoring procedure is questionable in validating the instrument. Further, using individual items, intermediate scores (masculinity and femininity scores), and total score (androgyny score) could lead to confusion in the results because of the three differing levels of abstraction in the data.

Spence _et al_. (1975) were concerned that in order to be classified as androgynous on the BSRI, a person must choose a balance of masculine and feminine traits as self-descriptive. Using this system it is not possible to distinguish between a person who scores as androgynous because of low scores on both scales and one who scores as androgynous because of high scores on both scales. They have suggested designating as androgynous only those who score high masculine and high feminine. Those individuals who score low on both scales are described as undifferentiated. They further suggested not using the t ratio to determine the final score; instead the subject population would be split at the median point of both the male and female valued scales, resulting in four groups: low male valued, low female valued (undifferentiated); low male valued, high female valued (feminine); high male valued, low female valued (masculine); and high male valued, high female valued (androgynous).

Regardless of these changes, a problem remains with the BSRI. As scores are based on the individual group being evaluated, it is theoretically possible for an individual to score as one type in one group and as another type in another group. A set of national norms would eliminate this problem.

A study by Deutsch and Gilbert (1976) used the BSRI to investigate the effects of sex-role stereotyping on personal adjustment. They asked college men and women to fill out four forms of the BSRI--one in terms of real self, one as ideal self, one as ideal man/woman, and one as men's/women's ideal woman/man. The women's sex-role concepts regarding their real self, their ideal self, and their belief of what the other sex desires were highly dissimilar, whereas those of men were highly similar. Thus the women showed ambivalence concerning their roles whereas the men found no discrepancy between their role and the ideal. They postulated that the acquisition of masculine traits by women may be adjustive in a male-oriented culture. Men, however, have no need to adopt feminine traits in order to be adjusted in a masculine society.

Gump (1972) approached the manner of the correlation between sex-role attitudes and psychological well-being in women by examining the relationship between ego-strength and traditionality of the female sex role. She found that ego strength may be negatively related to the adoption of the traditional sex role. This conclusion is open to some doubt because while the significance level was less than .10, it did not reach the .05 level.

Cecil, Paul, and Olins (1973), in a study of variables used to evaluate male and female job applications, developed an instrument of 50 items of the variables which are most frequently used for this purpose. The items were compared by sex using the Mann-Whitney U test, and it was found that five variables were more important for males to possess than for females, and six variables were more important for females than for males. The variables considered more important for males were: (1) ability to change mind on an issue; (2) persuasive individual; (3) capable of withstanding a great deal of pressure; (4) exceptional motivation; and (5) is aggressive. The variables for females were (1) pleasant voice; (2) excellent clerical skills; (3) finished high school; (4) excellent computational skills; (5) immaculate in dress and person; and (6) ability to express self well. A factor analysis was performed on the data collected, and the following factors were found: (1) motivation - ability; (2) personality - appearance; (3) interpersonal relations; and (4) skills - education. The authors concluded that factors 1 and 3 related to the male applicant and factors 2 and 4 to the female applicant. There are, however, some problems with their study, both in terms of write-up and in the data analysis. There was no mention of the type of factor analysis, particularly in terms of method of factor extraction, method used to determine number of factors to rotate, and method of rotation. Their N of 118 subjects is insufficient for a factor analysis of a 50-item scale. In addition, essentially two different instruments were used because the directions to the subjects were changed for half of the administrations. One set used a masculine name while the other used a feminine name; the two were then pooled and treated as one instrument. Further, the factor structure obtained was for all subjects; and no attempt was made to run separate factor analyses to determine if the factor structure was the same for both sexes. These problems leave open to doubt their conclusion that "discrimination in hiring may very well be a two-way street, depending on the job in question" (p. 407) because, as they state, female applicants may experience more difficulty than male applicants in securing managerial positions and male applicants may find similar difficulties in finding clerical positions.

In a study of anxiety correlated with sex-role identity in college students, Cosentino and Heilbrun (1964) examined the relationship between aggression anxiety (AA), manifest anxiety (MA), and sex-role adoption (M-F). An 80-item questionnaire developed to measure aggression was administered, and only those twelve items related to AA were scored and used. The Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale was used to determine MA while the masculinity-femininity scale of the Adjective Check List was utilized for the M-F determination. The authors found significant negative correlations between masculinity and both anxiety measures, and a positive correlation between the two anxiety scores. Further, they determined that greater femininity is associated with greater aggression anxiety for both males and females.

One problem with this study was readily apparent. The authors stated that the AA questionnaire was designed for use with twelve-year-old children but that the "item content and wording appeared appropriate for college age Ss" (p. 729). There is no indication that any strong method of validation for the college age group on this instrument was attempted.

Several problems were delineated in the previous studies, and they tend to arise in other studies that were reviewed but are not reported. Some are common to research into the social science areas, e.g. inappropriate sampling procedures, insufficient number of subjects, inappropriate use of instruments, and inappropriate statistical procedures. A further problem, and one that is particularly pertinent to this study, is the almost complete absence of determination of factor invariance across sex. However, unless such invariance can be demonstrated, the results of any study will be open to question because there can be no assurance that any differences indicated may not be related to differing factor structures rather than actual differences between criterion groups.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Using factor analysis this study examined the structure of certain sex roles to determine if there are underlying functional differences by sex.

Instrumentation

This study utilized the semantic differential of which Osgood _et al_. (1957) say:

> . . . it is a very general way of getting at a certain type of information, a highly generalizable technique of measurement which must be adapted to the requirement of each research problem to which it is applied. There are no standard concepts and no standard scales; rather, the concepts and scales used in a particular study depend upon the purposes of the researcher. (p. 76)

Therefore, in order to study the roles of men and women, different aspects of these roles were selected for investigation. They include two generalized concepts, "Men" and "Women," plus four more explicit areas, "Men at Home," "Women at Home," "Men at Work," and "Women at Work" (see Appendix A for copy of initial instrument.) These appear to fit the criteria listed in _The Measurement of Meaning_ (Osgood _et al_., 1957):

1. select concepts for meanings from which the investigator can expect considerable individual differences;
2. select concepts having a single, unitary meaning for the individual; and
3. select concepts that can be expected to be familiar to all subjects.

Selection of the scales also followed the suggestions of the authors in that they are relevant to the concept being judged. In order to meet this criterion, several sources pertaining to the roles of men and women were examined, and an initial list of words considered relevant to this study was compiled. The first source, the Bem Sex Role Inventory, is a measure of androgyny. The items for the BSRI were selected from an initial list of 200 personality characteristics that were both positive and negative in value and either masculine or feminine in tone. The final 40 items (20 masculine and 20 feminine) were selected for the extent to which the characteristics were more desirable for men or for women by judges who were college undergraduates. The items that were most characteristic were chosen for the final instrument (Bem, 1974).

The second source was a study by William and Best who used items from the Adjective Check List in an examination of sex-role stereotyping. They asked college men and women to determine the "typical" characteristics of men and women by categorizing each word. Further, the subjects were to rate the terms on a 5-point scale from "quite unfavorable" to "quite favorable" in nature, with the middle position being neutral. They found agreement between men and women on the ratings and therefore pooled the data to obtain a single mean favorability score and an index of stereotyping for each item reported (Williams & Best, 1977).

From these sources, 32 items were selected for inclusion in an initial instrument. This instrument was used in a pilot study and from the results, 25 items were selected for use in this research.

Pilot Study

Sixty students from differing major areas participated in a pilot study Spring Quarter, 1978, using the initial instrument developed for this research. It would have proved difficult to sample as completely for this pilot as was used for the final study; however, an effort was made to utilize students from as wide and diverse a population as possible. A breakdown of the characteristics of these students appears in Appendix A. The mean score and standard deviation for each item on all six sections for men and women as well as the results of a *t*-test by sex are also presented in Appendix A.

Generally, there was overall agreement between the sexes as to the roles of men and women. In only 19 of the 192 items was the *t*-test statistically significant at the .05 level. A summary of these significant differences follows.

1. Women
    a. Strong-Weak
    b. Submissive-Dominant
    c. Logical-Illogical
    d. Late-Prompt
    e. Sexy-Nonsexy
2. Women at Home
    a. Logical-Illogical
3. Women at Work
    a. Strong-Weak
    b. Active-Passive
    c. Sexy-Nonsexy
    d. Rational-Irrational

4. Men
    a. Affectionate-Nondemonstrative
    b. Cold-Warm
    c. Sexy-Nonsexy
    d. Charming-Offensive
5. Men at Home
    a. Submissive-Dominant
    b. Masculine-Feminine
    c. Direct-Evasive
6. Men at Work - Attractive-Unattractive

It is interesting to note that there is little disagreement between men and women as to roles in what has generally been considered their respective milieus, i.e., Women at Home, Men at Work. There is more disagreement when the roles are considered as general concepts and when men and women step out of what has been traditionally considered their purview.

In order to test the reliability of the items on the initial instrument, a second administration was completed on 12 male and 16 female students who participated in the pilot study. The complete results are presented in Appendix A.

When the items on the two administrations were correlated, only 10 of the 192 items failed to reach the .05 level of significance when all subjects were considered. A summary of those items that proved to be less reliable follows.

1. Women
    a. Active-Passive

   - b. Submissive-Dominant
   - c. Self Reliant-Dependent
2. Women at Home - all items reached the .05 level
3. Women at Work - Emotional-Unemotional
4. Men
   - a. Timid-Assertive
   - b. Sensitive-Insensitive
5. Men at Home
   - a. Conforming-Competitive
   - b. Late-Prompt
6. Men at Work
   - a. Conforming-Competitive
   - b. Timid-Assertive

Procedures for Study

Sampling Procedures

The subjects used in this study included male and female undergraduate students attending the University of Florida. A stratified sampling procedure was used in order to assure that sufficient numbers of male and female subjects were secured. A minimum of 250 female and 250 male undergraduate students was selected for the study. In order to insure that age of respondent would not be a confounding element, an upper limit for age of 25 was imposed.

Students in intact classrooms were utilized to secure the two samples. Although no precise stratification was sought, an effort was made to secure subjects from all undergraduate levels. Roughly one-fourth of the subjects were required from freshman, sophomore, junior and senior levels, respectively. The freshman and sophomore samples were secured from students enrolled in University College. This gave a representative cross-sample of freshman and sophomore students as these students take the greater portions of their courses in University College before moving into specific major areas for their junior and senior years. The junior and senior samples were drawn from upper division colleges. Of the 12 colleges that offer upper-level undergraduate courses, one class was selected from each. The particular class was a required junior or senior level course. Instructors were personally contacted by the researcher and were requested to allow distribution and collection of the instruments in their class during the class period. Completion of the instrument took approximately 15 minutes.

Data Collection

Data collection occurred during the third and fourth weeks of the Summer, 1978, Quarter at the University of Florida. The researcher or an associate visited the class of each instructor who consented to have his/her class used for the research.

In order to determine the representativeness of the sample, the following demographic information was solicited at the time of data collection:

1. Sex of respondent
2. Major field of study
3. Year in college
4. Age of respondent
5. Race of respondent
6. GPA at the end of the last quarter

Instrumentation

A sample of the final instrument used for data collection appears as Appendix B. More extensive description of the Semantic Differential technique on which the instrument is based appears earlier in this chapter.

Analysis of Data

The data analysis procedures followed were: (1) a factor analysis and rotation of each section of the instrument for each sex and (2) a comparison of factor structures across sex on each section of the instrument. A more precise procedural description follows.

The instruments completed by the subjects who participated in the study were separated as to sex. A separate factor analysis was performed for each sex on each section of the instrument with the same procedure being followed for each analysis.

For the first step of the factor analysis, an item intercorrelation matrix using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients was obtained. Multiple R squared was used as the initial estimate of the communalities, and iteration was performed to improve the estimates. For factor extraction the principal axis procedure was used. These initial procedures were conducted using computer program ED 501 from the Educational Evaluation Laboratory at the University of Florida (Guertin & Bailey, 1970).

After factor extraction, the decision as to the number of factors to rotate was made using the scree test. When the proper number of factors to rotate had been determined, an oblique solution called "simple loadings" was run utilizing program ED 512 (Guertin & Bailey, 1970).

There are distinct advantages to an oblique solution. One, it permits the angles between factors to depart from the 90° requirement for an orthogonal solution thus allowing for correlations between factors. This is advantageous because there is an interrelationship among many of the constructs with which social scientists deal. Thus to force orthogonality on a factor solution arbitrarily may obstruct the meaning underlying the phenomena. Further, determining the correlations between factors gives information that can be used to lead to more general and comprehensive constructs by using second-order factor analysis. Two, the clusters of variables will be better defined. An oblique solution allows the central or nuclear members of the cluster to be identified by their high loadings whereas an orthogonal solution may not have the central variables loading very high on the relevant factor (Rummel, 1970).

Two types of factor matrices result from an oblique solution. The first, utilizing reference factors, gives the factor structure and the loadings are the product-moment correlations of the variables with the oblique factors. Since the structure loadings are correlations, the structure loading of a variable on two factors measures a variable's direct relationship with each factor and the interaction between the two factors. The second, which uses primary axes, contains only the unique contribution each factor makes to the variance of the variables. The loadings are not true correlations and are referred to as coefficients. Rather than generating a factor structure, the primary matrix gives the factor pattern. Because it more clearly defines the simple structure configuration, the pattern matrix is best for determining the clusters of variables defined by oblique factors (Rummel, 1970) and is the form in which matrices in this study are reported.

In order to determine if the factor patterns underlying the different sections of this instrument are the same for both sexes, it was first necessary to determine which, if any, factors were similar. For the purposes of this study, two factors were considered similar when:

1. they had 50 percent of their items shared in common, and
2. the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the factor loadings on the respective factors was .71 or greater. This figure was used rather than the specific figure for statistical significance because the latter represents only 15 percent variance shared in common at the .05 level of significance and 24 percent at the .01 level. The more stringent level was used because it is considered more appropriate for at least 50 percent of the variance to be shared in common to consider factors similar, and the .71 correlation represents this commonality.

Factors were examined to find which, if any, met the first criterion; those that did were then analyzed to determine if they met the second. Only those that met both criteria were considered to be similar.

Equivalence of factor structure was considered met if all factors for one sex had a similar counterpart for the other sex.

Comparisons of factor patterns between male and female subjects were completed on the following concepts:

1. Women
2. Women at Home
3. Women at Work
4. Men
5. Men at Home
6. Men at Work

Limitations

As this study was essentially descriptive in nature, no treatment was utilized. Of the possible threats to internal validity, only one seemed pertinent. Some form of contemporary history could have confounded the issue if one of the classes sampled had included the general issue of sex roles or some related area. Therefore, no class that contained material in this area was utilized for the purposes of this study.

Descriptive research is useful insofar as the sample is representative of the population it is intended to describe. The fact that men and women are not equally represented in the different subject areas in colleges was given earlier in this paper. This presented no problem with the freshman and sophomore samples because the University College system used at the University of Florida serves to intermix these two levels of students. For the junior and senior levels, sampling methods necessarily drew male and female subjects from different major areas in many cases. An initial examination of demographic data would lead to the conclusion that the samples are unbalanced as to major field. However, as this condition exists generally throughout all segments of the college population, it was considered a problem only if the imbalance existed when the sample was compared to the general college population. The collection of the demographic data assisted in this comparison.

As this study was restricted to college undergraduate students, no generalizability to other populations would be appropriate. Further, the age limitation would present difficulties in extrapolating the findings to an older population.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The results of the analyses performed are presented in this chapter. Two basic areas are included: (1) comparison of the subject sample to its parent population and (2) comparison between sexes of factor patterns for each of the six sections of the instrument. In order to prevent possible difficulties in understanding, the terms male/female or men/women are used to refer to subjects and Men/Women (note capitalization) are used when referring to sections of the instrument.

Sample

A comparison of the subject sample by class, major, and race to the population from which it was drawn is presented in Table 5. In general it will be noted that the sampling for male students was very successful, while for female students there was a slight difference between sample percentages and population percentages. No attempt was made to adjust for these discrepancies before running the analyses since it was felt that they were not sufficiently extreme to affect the final outcome.

Comparison of Sections of the Instrument by Sex

Women

Female subjects

Table 6 gives the primary factor pattern that resulted when the section Women, as responded to by female subjects, was factor

TABLE 5

THE PERCENTAGES OF MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS IN THE STUDY SAMPLE AS COMPARED WITH THE UNIVERSITY POPULATION BY CLASS, MAJOR, AND RACE

	Males (N=251)			Females (N=250)		
	Sample		Population	Sample		Population
	N	%	%	N	%	%
Class						
Freshman	54	21.2	22.5	84	33.9	23.0
Sophomore	43	17.2	19.6	34	13.7	19.3
Junior	76	30.4	30.8	56	22.6	30.9
Senior	78	31.2	27.1	74	29.8	26.8
Major						
University College	102	41.0	47.7	118	48.4	52.1
Engineering	42	16.9	14.4	6	2.5	2.1
Arts and Sciences	50	20.1	21.2	33	13.5	21.5
Business Admin.	31	12.4	11.3	18	7.4	6.2
Journalism	20	8.0	4.0	40	16.4	6.8
Education	4	1.6	1.4	29	11.9	11.3
Race						
Caucasian	229	91.6	92.2	212	85.8	90.7
Non-Caucasian	21	8.4	7.8	35	14.2	9.3

TABLE 6

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings				
		I	II	III	IV	V
Affective	Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.74				
	Unemotional-Emotional	-.70				
	Motherly-Fatherly	.53				
	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.50				
	Gentle-Harsh	.49				-.31
	Soft-Hard	.44		.41		
	Masculine-Feminine	-.38				
Cognitive	Logical-Illogical		.72			
	Careful-Impulsive		.69			
	Rational-Irrational		.63			
	Childlike-Mature		-.59			
	Confident-Unsure		.35	.30		
	Ambitious-Unambitious		.33			
Physical Attractiveness	Sexy-Nonsexy			.76		
	Boring-Interesting			-.62		
	Attractive-Unattractive			.61		
	Pleasant-Unpleasant			.42		
Potency	Aggressive-Unaggressive				.83	
	Strong-Weak				.53	
	Adventurous-Reticent			.30	.39	

Table 6 - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings I	II	III	IV	V
(Unnamed)	Cold-Warm	.46				-.47
	Submissive-Dominating				.35	-.40
	Direct-Evasive					.40
Sum of Squared Loadings		2.61	2.33	2.27	1.58	1.01

analyzed.* Although five factors resulted, only four were sufficiently clear to be interpreted. The first, entitled *Affective*, generally focuses on the "feeling" realm of the personality. Of note is the fact that the sex-role items, "Motherly-Fatherly," "Masculine-Feminine," load on this factor. The second area, entitled *Cognitive*, pertains to the perceptual or rational realm of the personality. The *Physical Attractiveness* factor contains terms that tend to make some appraisal of the subjects that is generally physical in nature. The fourth and final factor includes items that measure power and is therefore termed *Potency*. The angles and correlations between factors are given in Table 7. Only those correlations ≥ .40 will be considered large enough to allow for interpretation. As none of these meets this criterion, no further discussion follows for this group of correlations.

Male subjects

The seven factors resulting from the factor analysis of this data are given in Table 8. Two of the factors, *Cognitive* and *Physical Attractiveness*, are similar to those from the analysis of the responses of the female subjects on this section of the instrument and will not be repeated here.

The area entitled *Affective* for females divided into two factors for males. The sex-role items (e.g. "Motherly-Fatherly," "Masculine-Feminine") loaded on the first and largest factor; consequently, this factor has been subtitled *Sex Role*. The second and related factor contained items that generally pertain to emotionality and thus is subtitled *Expressive*.

---

*Only salient loadings, i.e. ≥ .30 are given in the tables in this chapter. The complete results of the factor analyses are given in Appendix

TABLE 7

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Factor		Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV
I	Correlation	---			
	Angle	---			
II	Correlation	.06	---		
	Angle	87°	---		
III	Correlation	.30	.35	---	
	Angle	72°	70°	---	
IV	Correlation	-.14	.21	.26	---
	Angle	98°	78°	75°	---

TABLE 8

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings						
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Affective/ Sex Role	Masculine-Feminine	-.62						
	Motherly-Fatherly	.58						
	Cold-Warm	-.46				-.36		
	Gentle-Harsh	.34	.31					
Affective/ Expressive	Soft-Hard		.62		.34			
	Unemotional-Emotional		-.55	-.33				
Cognitive	Logical-Illogical			.79				
	Rational-Irrational			.67				
	Careful-Impulsive			.63				
	Direct-Evasive			.43				.31
	Childlike-Mature			-.34				
Physical Attractiveness	Sexy-Nonsexy				.73			
	Attractive-Unattractive				.68			
	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.36			.45			
	Pleasant-Unpleasant				.41			
Potency	Ambitious-Unambitious				.31	.63		
	Boring-Interesting					-.48		
	Strong-Weak					.33		
Potency	Aggressive-Unaggressive						.60	
	Analytical-Unanalytical			.45			.48	
	Confident-Unsure			-.33			.38	
	Adventurous-Reticent						.37	

Table 8 - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings						
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Potency	Dependent-SelfReliant							-.40
	Submissive-Dominating							-.39
Sum of Squared Loadings		1.38	1.10	2.41	1.71	1.26	1.19	0.83

Three somewhat ambiguous factors that have items generally considered associated with "potency" also resulted, but no underlying pattern among these terms is readily apparent so as to permit subcategorization.

The correlations and angles between factors are given in Table 9. Again the .40 criterion for relationship was not reached, and no further explanation is tendered.

Comparison between sexes

In order to facilitate a comparison of factors between the sexes, a table listing the four basic areas resulting from the analyses of this section of the instrument (Affective, Cognitive, Physical Attractiveness, and Potency) and the items in these areas has been prepared (Table 10). The percent of area item commonality which compares each factor produced from the responses of one sex in each area with factors for the other sex in the corresponding area is also listed. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the respective factor loadings for those areas that shared 50 percent or more items in common completes the information given in this table. While the data of both groups produced four general areas, all of the areas for the female subjects are made up of one factor each. However, two of the basic areas, Affective and Potency, contain more than one factor for the male subjects. This difference indicates a tendency on the part of the men participating in the study to discriminate more in these areas of this particular aspect of sex roles.

Both sex-role items load on affective factors for men and women, although the loading for the term "Masculine-Feminine" is considerably larger for men than for women. This tendency for the sex-role items

TABLE 9

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Factor		Factor I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
I	Correlation	---						
	Angle	---						
II	Correlation	.18	---					
	Angle	80°	---					
III	Correlation	.20	-.02	---				
	Angle	78°	91°	---				
IV	Correlation	.33	.26	.05	---			
	Angle	71°	75°	87°	---			
V	Correlation	.19	-.01	.25	.28	---		
	Angle	79°	91°	75°	74°	---		
VI	Correlation	-.14	-.07	.14	-.01	.13	---	
	Angle	98°	94°	82°	91°	83°	---	
VII	Correlation	.05	-.10	.19	.07	.22	-.10	---
	Angle	87°	96°	79°	86°	77°	96°	---

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings			Percent of Area Item Commonality		Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient	
Affective	Female I	Male I	Male II	FI,MI	FI,MII	FI,MI	FI,MII
Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.74	----	----	38	29	Not computed	
Unemotional-Emotional	-.70		-.55				
*Motherly-Fatherly	.53	.58	----				
*Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.50	----	----				
Gentle-Harsh	.49	.34	----				
Soft-Hard	.44	----	.62				
Masculine-Feminine	-.38	-.62	----				
Cognitive	Female II	Male III		FII,MIII		FII,MIII	
*Logical-Illogical	.72	.79		57		.84	
*Careful-Impulsive	.69	.63					
*Rational-Irrational	.63	.67					
*Childlike-Mature	-.59	-.34					
*Confident-Unsure	.35	----					
*Ambitious-Unambitious	.33	----					
*Direct-Evasive	----	.43					

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

Table 10 - Continued

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings				Percent of Area Item Commonality		Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient	
Physical Attractiveness		Female III	Male IV		FIII,MIV		FIII,MIV	
*Sexy-Nonsexy		.76	.73		60		71	
Boring-Interesting		-.62	----					
*Attractive-Unattractive		.61	.68					
Pleasant-Unpleasant		.42	.41					
*Affectionate-Nondemonstrative		----	.45					
Potency	Female IV	Male V	Male VI	Male VII	FIV,MV	FIV.MVI	FIV,MV	FIV,MVI
*Aggressive-Unaggressive	.83	----	.60	----	20	40	Not Computed	
*Strong-Weak	.53	.33	----	----				
*Adventurous-Reticent	.39	----	.37	----	FIV,MVII		FIV,MVII	
*Ambitious-Unambitious	----	.63	----	----				
Boring-Interesting	----	-.48	----	----	0		Not Computed	
*Analytical-Nonanalytical	----	----	.48	----				
*Confident-Unsure	----	----	.38	----				
*Dependent-SelfReliant	----	----	----	-.40				
*Submissive-Dominating	----	----	----	-.39				

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

to load on an affective factor indicates that both males and females view the sex role of women as related to the affective part of women's natures. While the two Affective factors produced from the responses of the male subjects have items shared in common with the one factor for female subjects in this area, neither comparison reached the area item commonality criterion and therefore the factors are not considered equivalent across sex.

The Cognitive area for the two groups has four of seven items in common, including the three highest-loading items for each group. The correlation between the factor loadings is .84, and on these bases these two factors are considered equivalent. The Physical Attractiveness factors, with three of five items common to both groups (60 percent) and a correlation of .71 between loadings, are also found to be similar.

There is more disagreement on the Potency areas as only two of nine items load similarly. The problem arises from (1) the blurring in the analysis of the male subjects' data with three somewhat ambiguous factors and (2) the small size of the factor for the female subjects, with only three items loading. While the factors for both groups can be identified as pertaining to potency by the items loading on them, e.g. "Strong-Weak," "Aggressive-Unaggressive," "Submissive-Dominating," there appears to be some disagreement between the groups about the item makeup of this area.

Although not basic to the purposes of this study, a z-test to test for differences between means by sex was performed for each item on each section of the instrument. Differences where $p \leq .01$ are indicated on the tables that compare the factors.

Men

Female subjects

Table 11 gives the primary factor pattern that emerged when the data for the section Men, as responded to by female subjects, was factor analyzed. Seven factors resulted; however, two consisted of single terms and are not reported.

The Cognitive area generally pertains to the system used to perceive one's environment. Words such as "Logical-Illogical" and "Rational-Irrational" load heavily on this factor. The Physical Attractiveness area is almost exclusively made up of items representative of that feature.

A new area was introduced from the analysis of the data from this section of the instrument. The items loading most heavily for this area, "Confident-Unsure," and "Childlike-Mature," suggest a general feeling of maturity, thus its title. The smaller-loading items suggest a flavor of "Beau Brummel" leading to the impression of a mature, dashing figure.

The correlations and angles between factors are reported in Table 12.

Male subjects

Seven factors resulted from the factor analysis of the data from this section of the instrument. However, one factor consists of only one item and is not reported. The other six factors are given in Table 13, and all are interpreted.

The Affective and Cognitive realms appear as single factors when the responses of male subjects were factor analyzed. The items that made up the factors are generally the same as those for the female subjects.

TABLE 11

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings				
		I	II	III	IV	V
Affective	Gentle-Harsh	.66				
	Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.66				
	Unemotional-Emotional	-.66				
	Cold-Warm	-.65				
	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.52				
	Soft-Hard	.43			-.34	
Cognitive	Logical-Illogical		.88			
	Rational-Irrational		.59			
	Careful-Impulsive		.50			
	Direct-Evasive		.36			
Physical Attractiveness	Sexy-Nonsexy			.80		
	Attractive-Unattractive			.77		
	Pleasant-Unpleasant			.31		
Potency/ Sex Role	Masculine-Feminine				.69	
	Motherly-Fatherly				-.64	
	Aggressive-Unaggressive				.58	
	Submissive-Dominating				-.52	
	Strong-Weak				.45	

Table LI - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings				
		I	II	III	IV	V
Maturity	Confident-Unsure					.72
	Childlike-Mature					-.49
	Adventurous-Reticent					.35
Sum of Squared Loadings		2.41	1.81	1.58	2.03	1.27

TABLE 12

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Factor		Factor I	II	III	IV	V
I	Correlation	---				
	Angle	---				
II	Correlation	.24	---			
	Angle	76°	---			
III	Correlation	.32	.29	---		
	Angle	71°	73°	---		
IV	Correlation	-.06	.21	.28	---	
	Angle	93°	78°	74°	---	
V	Correlation	.15	.33	.32	.38	---
	Angle	81°	71°	71°	68°	---

TABLE 13

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Affective	Gentle-Harsh	.72					
	Cold-Warm	-.68					
	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.63					
	Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.61					
	Unemotional-Emotional	-.45					
Cognitive	Logical-Illogical		.72				
	Analytical-Nonanalytical		.65				
	Rational-Irrational		.65				
	Careful-Impulsive		.42				
	Direct-Evasive		.33				
Physical Attractiveness	Attractive-Unattractive			.70			
	Sexy-Nonsexy			.70			
Potency	Strong-Weak				.78		
	Aggressive-Unaggressive				.73		
	Soft-Hard				-.42		
Potency/ Sex Role	Masculine-Feminine					.57	
	Motherly-Fatherly					-.43	
	Submissive-Dominating					-.40	
	Ambitious-Unambitious		.31			.34	

Table 13 - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Maturity	Confident-Unsure						.66
	Pleasant-Unpleasant			.35			.47
	Childlike-Mature						-.46
	Boring-Interesting						-.32
Sum of Squared Loadings		2.27	2.06	1.39	1.62	1.16	1.22

The Physical Attractiveness and Maturity factors emerged from the analysis of the men's data as they did from that of the women, and the items and loadings for the males are similar to those of their female counterparts.

As viewed by the male subjects, Potency is not a single dimension. It divides instead into an area that is concerned with "strength" and one that has the two sex-role items loading most heavily on it.

Table 14 gives the correlations and angles between factors for this section of the instrument.

Comparison between sexes

Table 15 presents a comparison by sex of the five basic areas that resulted from the analysis of this section of the instrument. The Affective, Cognitive, Physical Attractiveness, and Maturity areas are made up of single factors for both groups. The items loading on each factor, respectively, are with little exception, the same for both groups, and the correlations all reached the required criterion. Both the area item commonality requirement and the correlation requirement were met in all four of these areas, and from this it may be concluded that there is similarity between the groups in each of these areas.

There was more disagreement in the Potency realm as men subdivided this area into two distinct parts whereas women viewed it as a whole. Both groups considered the sex role of men as potent in nature. However, the men seem to discriminate more by separating the sex role from the "strength" aspects. While the first did not, the second of the two male factors reached the 50 percent item commonality criterion with the female factor. However, the correlation between the two factors was slightly below the required level, and the factors are not considered similar.

TABLE 14

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Factor		Factor					
		I	II	III	IV	V	IV
I	Correlation	---					
	Angle	---					
II	Correlation	.25	---				
	Angle	75°	---				
III	Correlation	.39	.28	---			
	Angle	67°	74°	---			
IV	Correlation	.01	.12	.06	---		
	Angle	89°	83°	86°	---		
V	Correlation	.07	.17	.02	.38	---	
	Angle	86°	80°	89°	68°	---	
VI	Correlation	.38	.28	.19	.24	.21	---
	Angle	68°	74°	79°	76°	78°	---

TABLE 15

COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings		Percent of Area Item Commonality	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient
Affective	Female I	Male I	FI,MI	FI,MI
*Gentle-Harsh	.66	.72	83	.90
Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.66	-.61		
Unemotional-Emotional	-.66	-.45		
Cold-Warm	-.65	-.68		
*Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.52	.63		
*Soft-Hard	.43	----		
Cognitive	Female II	Male II	FII,MII	FII,MII
Logical-Illogical	.88	.72	80	.77
Rational-Irrational	.59	.65		
Careful-Impulsive	.50	.42		
Direct-Evasive	.36	.33		
*Analytical-Nonanalytical	----	.65		
Physical Attractiveness	Female III	Male III	FIII,MIII	FIII,MIII
*Sexy-Nonsexy	.80	.70	67	.87
*Attractive-Unattractive	.77	.70		
*Pleasant-Unpleasant	.31	----		

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

Table 15 - Continued

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings			Percent of Area Item Commonality		Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient	
Potency	Female IV	Male IV	Male V	FIV,MIV	FIV,MV	FIV,MIV	FIV,MV
Masculine-Feminine	.69	----	.57	33	50	Not Computed	.70
Motherly-Fatherly	-.64	----	-.43				
Aggressive-Unaggressive	.58	.73	----				
Submissive-Dominating	-.52	----	-.40				
Strong-Weak	.45	.78	----				
*Soft-Hard	----	-.42	----				
Ambitious-Unambitious	----	----	.34				
Maturity	Female V	Male VI		FV,MVI		FV,MVI	
Confident-Unsure	.72	.66		60		.65	
*Childlike-Mature	-.49	-.46					
*Boring-Interesting	----	-.32					
Adventurous-Reticent	.35	----					
*Pleasant-Unpleasant	.31	.47					

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

Women At Home

Female subjects

When the role of women was narrowed from the general concept "Women" to the more specific "Women at Home," a factor analysis of the responses of the female subjects produced five factors as shown in Table 16. The Cognitive, Physical Attractiveness and Potency areas were reproduced in toto while the Affective area differed somewhat. The "Masculine-Feminine" item, while indicated as loading on this factor, loads somewhat more strongly on a separate factor and on the Potency factor as well, indicating a possible blurring of the differences between the areas. The negative sign with the "Soft-Hard" item in Factor V is a reversal of this item from the previous analysis of the section Women as answered by female subjects. This indicates a positive relationship between "feminine" and "hard" rather than a negative one as had previously been found.

Correlations and angles between factors are presented in Table 17.

Male subjects

A factor analysis of the responses of the male subjects yielded the seven factors presented in Table 18. Three, Potency, Physical Attractiveness, and Cognitive, emerged as single factors and are essentially the same as in previous analyses.

The Affective area divided into two factors although no clear, underlying reason is readily apparent. The sex-role items load on the largest of these two factors.

A new area, Outgoing Personality which is composed of two factors, resulted from the analysis of the responses of the male subjects. The first factor is concerned mainly with the way women are perceived as

TABLE 16

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings				
		I	II	III	IV	V
Affective	Cold-Warm	-.85				
	Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.71				
	Gentle-Harsh	.70				
	Unemotional-Emotional	-.63				
	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.57				
	Motherly-Fatherly	.41				
Cognitive	Careful-Impulsive		.80			
	Logical-Illogical		.78			
	Rational-Irrational		.74			
	Childlike-Mature		-.74		-.32	
	Direct-Evasive		.43			
Physical Attractiveness	Attractive-Unattractive			.79		
	Sexy-Nonsexy			.73		
	Boring-Interesting			-.40		
	Pleasant-Unpleasant	.31	.35	.40		
Potency	Aggressive-Unaggressive				.85	
	Strong-Weak				.74	
	Submissive-Dominating				-.71	
	Adventurous-Reticent			.36	.53	
	Confident-Unsure		.33		.51	
	Ambitious-Unambitious			.43	.43	
	Dependent-SelfReliant				-.39	
	Analytical-Nonanalytical				.37	

Table 16 - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings				
		I	II	III	IV	V
Sex Role	Soft-Hard	.38				-.44
	Masculine-Feminine	-.37			.39	-.40
Sum of Squared Loadings		3.03	2.68	2.23	3.35	0.66

TABLE 17

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Factor		Factor				
		I	II	III	IV	V
I	Correlation	---				
	Angle	---				
II	Correlation	-.02	---			
	Angle	91°	---			
III	Correlation	.17	.13	---		
	Angle	80°	83°	---		
IV	Correlation	.16	.05	.36	---	
	Angle	81°	87°	69°	---	
V	Correlation	-.24	.17	.36	.34	---
	Angle	104°	87°	69°	70°	---

TABLE 18

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings						
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Affective/ Sex Role	Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.76						
	Motherly-Fatherly	.75						
	Gentle-Harsh	.65						
	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.63						
	Cold-Warm	-.60						
	Masculine-Feminine	-.42	.32					.40
	Pleasant-Unpleasant	.39						
Affective	Unemotional-Emotional	-.33	-.48					
	Soft-Hard		.45				.32	
	Dependent-SelfReliant		.33			-.31		
Cognitive	Careful-Impulsive			.69				
	Logical-Illogical			.64				
	Rational-Irrational			.55		.30		
	Childlike-Mature			-.31				
Outgoing Personality/ Interactive	Direct-Evasive				.66			
	Confident-Unsure				.62			
Outgoing Personality/ Adventurous	Adventurous-Reticent					.58		
	Boring-Interesting					-.52		
	Ambitious-Unambitious					.38		

Table 18 - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings						
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Physical Attractiveness	Attractive-Unattractive						.88	
	Sexy-Nonsexy						.81	
Potency	Strong-Weak							.78
	Aggressive-Unaggressive							.69
	Submissive-Dominating							-.60
	Analytical-Nonanalytical							.32
Sum of Squared Loadings		2.91	0.78	1.54	1.30	1.15	1.91	1.92

interacting with others and thus is subtitled Interactive. The second, again a "Beau Brummel" type, represents an outgoing, "adventurous" personality.

Table 19 gives the correlations and angles between factors for this section of the instrument. The positive correlation (.44) between the larger (i.e. greater sum of squared values) Affective factor and the Physical Attractiveness factor suggests that men conceptualize a positive relationship between physical attractiveness and the affective sphere of women when considering women in their role in the home. The .41 correlation between the two Outgoing Personality factors indicates their interrelatedness.

Comparison between sexes

Table 20 presents a comparison of the basic areas between sexes for this section of the instrument. Examination of this table indicates the following.

The comparison between the one Affective factor (Factor I) for female subjects and Factor I for male subjects reveals that both measures used to relate factors reached criterion level; therefore these two factors are considered similar. However, there was an additional Affective factor produced from the analysis of the responses of the male subjects which indicates their tendency to have a broader view of this aspect of women's roles. Further, although the "Motherly-Fatherly" item loads on the Factor I of both groups, the "Masculine-Feminine" item, while loading in the Affective area for the male subjects, behaves differently for the female subjects. It loads almost equally on the larger Affective factor, the Potency factor, and a smaller affective-type factor (termed Sex Role). Thus, the parental role

TABLE 19

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

		Factor						
Factor		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
I	Correlation	---						
	Angle	---						
II	Correlation	.22	---					
	Angle	77°	---					
III	Correlation	.14	-.07	---				
	Angle	82°	94°	---				
IV	Correlation	-.10	-.20	.34	---			
	Angle	96°	101°	70°	---			
V	Correlation	-.03	-.08	.22	.41	---		
	Angle	92°	95°	77°	66°	---		
VI	Correlation	.44	.12	.21	.14	.32	---	
	Angle	64°	83°	78°	82°	71°	---	
VII	Correlation	-.31	-.21	.19	.39	.32	-.03	---
	Angle	108°	102°	79°	67°	71°	92°	---

TABLE 20

COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings			Percent of Area Item Commonality		Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient	
Affective	Female I	Male I	Male II	FI,MI	FI,MII	FI,MI	FI,MII
Cold-Warm	-.85	-.60	----	75	11	.90	Not Computed
Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.71	-.76	----				
Gentle-Harsh	.70	.65	----				
Unemotional-Emotional	-.63	----	-.48				
Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.57	.63	----				
Motherly-Fatherly	.41	.75	----				
Soft-Hard	----	----	.45				
Masculine-Feminine	-.37	-.42	----				
Pleasant-Unpleasant	----	.39	----				
Dependent-SelfReliant	----	----	.33				
Cognitive	Female II	Male III		FII,MIII		FII,MIII	
*Careful-Impulsive	.80	.69		80		.86	
*Logical-Illogical	.78	.64					
*Rational-Irrational	.74	.55					
Childlike-Mature	-.47	-.31					
Direct-Evasive	.43	----					

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

Table 20 - Continued

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings		Percent of Area Item Commonality	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient
Outgoing Personality	Male IV	Male V		
Direct-Evasive	.66	----		
Confident-Unsure	.62	----		
Adventurous-Reticent	----	.58		
*Boring-Interesting	----	-.52		
Ambitious-Unambitious	----	.38		
Physical Attractiveness	Female III	Male VI	FIII,MVI	FIII,MVI
*Attractive-Unattractive	.79	.88	50	.81
*Sexy-Nonsexy	.73	.81		
*Boring-Interesting	-.40	----		
Pleasant-Unpleasant	.40	----		
Potency	Female IV	Male VII	FIV,MVII	FIV,MVII
Aggressive-Unaggressive	.85	.79	44	Not Computed
Strong-Weak	.74	.78		
Submissive-Dominating	-.71	-.60		
Adventurous-Reticent	.53	----		
Confident-Unsure	.51	----		
Ambitious-Unambitious	.43	----		
Dependent-SelfReliant	-.39	----		

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

Table 20 - Continued

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings		Percent of Area Item Commonality	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient
Potency - Continued	Female IV	Male VII		
Analytical-Nonanalytical	.37	.32		
Masculine-Feminine	.39	----		
Sex Role	Female V			
Soft-Hard	-.44			
Masculine-Feminine	-.40			

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

appears well-defined, but there is some blurring of the general sex role.

Female subjects viewed the Cognitive area of their roles at home as a single factor as did the male subjects. These factors are considered similar because both criterion levels were met.

The Physical Attractiveness factors are similar for men and women with the heaviest loadings for both on the "Attractive-Unattractive," "Sexy-Nonsexy" items.

Both men and women view the Potency area as single factors, although several more items load for women than do for men. The largest-loading items are shared in common by both groups, but the sheer number of items loading on the factor for the female subjects suggests a response set on their part. Only four of the nine items are common to both groups, and on the basis of the criteria set up in Chapter III, these factors are not considered similar.

An Outgoing Personality area appeared for the men, but there is no corresponding area for the women. Instead the items that make up this separate area for men are loaded on other, more established areas for women. This difference in loading again illustrates a larger discrimination on the part of the male subjects.

A small factor, entitled Sex Role, appeared for female subjects although there is no corresponding one for male subjects. The emergence of this factor indicates an ambivalence in the minds of the women about their general sex role at home that is not present for the men.

Men At Home

Female subjects

When female subjects rated men in their roles in the home, the six factors presented in Table 21 appeared when the items were factor analyzed. Only five of the six are considered interpretable, and they will be considered here.

The Affective, Cognitive, and Potency factors appeared generally as they have previously. However, the Physical Attractiveness factor also has the "Beau Brummel" items loading on it making it necessary to broaden the name of the factor to Physical Attractiveness/Outgoing Personality.

A new area appeared, labeled here as Sex Role, because the two sex-role items are the only ones to load this factor. An attempt to categorize this factor by examining its correlation with other factors was unsuccessful because it is related mildly (+.34 to +.37) to three of the four other factors but unrelated to the fourth, the Affective factor.

Correlations and angles between factors are presented in Table 22. The Potency factor accounts for the stronger relationships as it correlates .44 with both the Physical Attractivensss/Outgoing Personality and Cognitive factors, indicating a relationship between power and attractiveness and power and cognition in the responses of the women.

Male subjects

When males rated themselves in their roles at home, the eight factors listed in Table 23 emerged. For the Affective realm, two separate factors appeared, one concerned with emotionality and the other with consistency, i.e. a degree of firmness. The Cognitive area appeared as it has previously and consisted of only one factor.

TABLE 21

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Affective	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.78					
	Cold-Warm	-.71					
	Gentle-Harsh	.68					
	Unemotional-Emotional	-.63					
	Soft-Hard	.54					
	Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.47	-.31				.30
Cognitive	Logical-Illogical		.74				
	Careful-Impulsive		.58				
	Childlike-Mature		-.57				
	Rational-Irrational		.54				
	Analytical-Nonanalytical		.47				
	Direct-Evasive		.44				
Physical Attractiveness/ Outgoing Personality	Sexy-Nonsexy			.78			
	Attractive-Unattractive			.74			
	Adventurous-Reticent			.65			
	Ambitious-Unambitious			.47			
	Boring-Interesting			-.42			
	Confident-Unsure			.37			

Table 21 - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Potency	Strong-Weak				.73		
	Aggressive-Unaggressive				.72		
	Submissive-Dominating				-.39	-.30	
Sex Role	Motherly-Fatherly					-.67	
	Masculine-Feminine					.60	
(Unnamed)	Pleasant-Unpleasant			.33			.44
	Dependent-SelfReliant						-.32
Sum of Squared Loadings		2.69	2.33	2.54	1.70	1.32	0.72

TABLE 22

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

		Factor				
Factor		I	II	III	IV	V
I	Correlation	---				
	Angle	---				
II	Correlation	.12	---			
	Angle	83°	---			
III	Correlation	.20	.39	---		
	Angle	78°	67°	---		
IV	Correlation	-.06	.44	.44	---	
	Angle	93°	64°	64°	---	
V	Correlation	-.02	.34	.34	.37	---
	Angle	91°	70°	70°	68°	---

TABLE 23

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings							
		I	II	III	VI	V	VI	VII	VIII
Affective/ Emotionality	Unemotional-Emotional	-.64							
	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.58							
	Cold-Warm	-.51							
	Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.51							
Affective/ Consistency	Gentle-Harsh		.64						
	Soft-Hard		.49						
Cognitive	Logical-Illogical			.78					
	Careful-Impulsive			.75					
	Rational-Irrational			.74					
Physical Attractiveness	Sexy-Nonsexy				.84				
	Attractive-Unattractive				.80				
Outgoing Personality/ Adventurous	Boring-Interesting					-.68			
	Adventurous-Reticent					.67			
	Pleasant-Unpleasant					.41			
Outgoing Personality/ SelfReliance	Dependent-SelfReliant						-.49		
	Ambitious-Unambitious					.34	.43		
	Direct-Evasive						.31		

Table 23 - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings							
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Potency	Aggressive-Unaggressive							.74	
	Strong-Weak							.66	
	Analytical-Nonanalytical							.49	
	Submissive-Dominating							-.34	
Sex Role/ Maturity	Motherly-Fatherly								-.65
	Masculine-Feminine							.30	.49
	Confident-Unsure		-.31		-.31				.42
	Childlike-Mature				.31				-.36
Sum of Squared Loadings		1.48	1.12	1.98	1.00	1.52	1.44	1.63	1.37

The Physical Attractiveness/Outgoing Personality area produced by the female subjects also emerged from the responses of the male subjects although three separate factors were necessary to explain the variance. The first factor in this area was made up of those items exclusively pertaining to physical attractiveness. The second, with items such as "Boring-Interesting" and "Adventurous-Reticent" loading most heavily, suggest an adventurous spirit. With items such as "Dependent-SelfReliant" and "Ambitious-Unambitious" represented, the third factor is subtitled Self-Reliance.

A Sex Role factor also appeared for the men with two items that denote maturity also loading on it. This factor correlates +.41 with the first Outgoing Personality factor and +.40 with the Potency factor. The correlation with the Potency factor is not surprising because the sex-role items loaded with this factor on the section Men. However, the stronger correlation with the Outgoing Personality factor indicates that these men view their sex roles as part of their "adventurous" natures. When the two sex-role items are examined individually, this factor appears to represent the parental role more strongly than the general sex role as witness an (ABS).65 loading for the former versus an (ABS).49 loading for the latter.

Table 24 lists the correlations and angles between the factors. Two of the correlations that reached the .40 level were discussed in the previous paragraph. There is a .44 correlation between the Physical Attractiveness and Outgoing Personality/Adventurous factors indicating a relationship between these two areas. The .43 correlation between the two Outgoing Personality factors indicates their interrelatedness as did the .43 correlation between the two Affective factors.

TABLE 24

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

	Factor							
Factor	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
I Correlation	---							
Angle	---							
II Correlation	.43	---						
Angle	65°	---						
III Correlation	.10	.11	---					
Angle	84°	84°	---					
IV Correlation	.33	.11	.27	---				
Angle	71°	84°	74°	---				
V Correlation	.23	-.04	.37	.44	---			
Angle	77°	92°	68°	64°	---			
VI Correlation	.05	-.11	.32	.18	.43	---		
Angle	87°	96°	71°	80°	65°	---		
VII Correlation	-.06	-.19	.28	.23	.38	.38	---	
Angle	93°	101°	74°	68°	77°	68°	---	
VIII Correlation	.16	-.06	.23	.28	.41	.32	.40	---
Angle	81°	93°	77°	74°	66°	71°	66°	---

Comparison between sexes

A comparison between factor patterns for the two groups (presented in Table 25) again showed that more factors are necessary to explain the variance produced by the male subjects. In three areas, Cognitive, Potency, and Sex Role, single factors were produced for both men and women. Generally, the same items load on the respective factors in these three areas, and there appears to be general agreement on the size of the loadings. Both criterion measures were met thus making the factors similar between groups in each of these areas.

The Affective domain consists of two factors for male subjects and one for females. Factor I for men shares 67 percent of its items with Factor I for women, and the loadings are correlated .84. Therefore these two factors are considered similar. The second factor for males has only 33 percent of its items shared in common with Factor I for females, and the factors are not considered equivalent.

There is a divergence of views between the two sexes for the areas of Physical Attractiveness and Outgoing Personality. For the female subjects the two concepts converged into one factor while for the males the two areas resulted in three separate, though related, factors. The single factor for the female subjects did not reach the 50 percent item commonality criterion with any of the three male factors; therefore there are no factors considered similar across sex in these areas.

Women At Work

Female subjects

The Affective, Cognitive, Physical Attractiveness, and Potency areas appeared when the responses for this section of the instrument were factor analyzed (see Table 26). The Cognitive area was much

TABLE 25

COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings			Percent of Area Item Commonality		Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient	
Affective	Female I	Male I	Male II	FI,MI	FI,MII	FI,MI	FI,MII
Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.78	.58	----	67	33	.84	Not Computed
*Cold-Warm	-.71	-.51	----				
Gentle-Harsh	.68	----	.64				
Unemotional-Emotional	-.63	-.64	----				
*Soft-Hard	.54	----	.49				
Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.47	-.51	----				
Cognitive	Female II	Male III		FII,MIII		FII,MIII	
Logical-Illogical	.74	.78		50		.80	
Careful-Impulsive	.58	.75					
*Childlike-Mature	-.57	----					
Rational-Irrational	.54	.74					
*Analytical-Nonanalytical	.47	----					
Direct-Evasive	.44	----					
Dependent-SelfReliant	----	----					
Ambitious-Unambitious	----	----					

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

Table 25 - Continued

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings				Percent of Area Item Commonality		Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient	
Physical Attractiveness/ Outgoing Personality	Female III	Male IV	Male V	Male VI	FIII,MIV	FIII,MV	FIII,MIV	FIII,MV
*Sexy-Nonsexy	.78	.84	----	----	33	29	Not Computed	
*Attractive-Unattractive	.74	.80	----	----				
Adventurous-Reticent	.65	----	.67	----	FIII,MVI		FIII,MVI	
Ambitious-Unambitious	.47	----	----	.43				
Boring-Interesting	-.42	----	-.68	----	13		Not Computed	
Confident-Unsure	.37	----	----	----				
Pleasant-Unpleasant	----	----	.41	----				
Dependent-SelfReliant	----	----	----	-.49				
Direct-Evasive	----	----	----	.31				
Potency	Female IV	Male VII			FIV,MVII		FIV,MVII	
Strong-Weak	.73	.66			.75		.80	
*Aggressive-Unaggressive	.72	.74						
Submissive-Dominating	-.39	-.34						
*Analytical-Nonanalytical	----	.49						
Sex Role	Female V	Male VIII			FV,MVIII		FV,MVIII	
Motherly-Fatherly	.67	.65			50		.78	
Masculine-Feminine	-.60	-.49						
Confident-Unsure	----	-.42						
*Childlike-Mature	----	.36						

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

TABLE 26

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings				
		I	II	III	IV	V
Affective	Cold-Warm	-.71				
	Unemotional-Emotional	-.70				
	Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.69				
	Gentle-Harsh	.62				
	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.58				
	Motherly-Fatherly	.51				
	Masculine-Feminine	-.43				
	Soft-Hard	.41				-.38
Cognitive	Direct-Evasive		.85			
	Logical-Illogical		.74			
	Confident-Unsure		.74			
	Rational-Irrational		.68			
	Careful-Impulsive		.60			
	Childlike-Mature		-.59			
	Ambitious-Unambitious		.47			
	Pleasant-Unpleasant		.37			
	Adventurous-Reticent		.33			
Physical Attractiveness	Sexy-Nonsexy			.79		
	Attractive-Unattractive			.57		

Table 26 - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings				
		I	II	III	IV	V
Potency	Aggressive-Unaggressive				.74	
	Submissive-Dominating				-.65	
	Strong-Weak				.51	
(Unnamed)	Dependent-SelfReliant					-.52
	Boring-Interesting					-.34
Sum of Squared Loadings		3.05	3.62	1.43	1.55	1.01

larger than had appeared in the other two analyses of women's roles as viewed by women. The additional items loading on the factor indicate a possible response set on the part of the subjects. The sex-role items load on the Affective factor indicating that women in this sample equate their identification as women with the affective parts of their personalities.

The correlations and angles between factors are presented in Table 27. The .44 correlation is between the Physical Attractiveness and Cognitive factors and indicates a relationship in the minds of the female subjects between their physical attractiveness and their reasoning powers when considered in their role at work.

Male subjects

The men presented a narrower focus on the roles of women when they are at work than was previously shown in other analyses. Only five factors (as presented in Table 28) are required to explain the variance contained in their responses. For the men, as for the women, the Cognitive domain is considerably larger than has appeared previously with eight items having salient loadings, again raising the possibility of a response set. The Physical Attractiveness factor is most strongly represented by the two physical attractiveness items. The Potency factor remained intact and consists generally of items that pertain to strength and power.

The Affective realm is divided into two factors. The largest has the sex-role items loading on it and therefore is subtitled Sex Role. Another, smaller, factor represents the consistency or degree of firmness of the role.

TABLE 27

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Factor		Factor			
		I	II	III	IV
I	Correlation	---			
	Angle	---			
II	Correlation	.18	---		
	Angle	80°	---		
III	Correlation	.37	.44	---	
	Angle	68°	64°	---	
IV	Correlation	-.08	.34	.20	---
	Angle	95°	70°	78°	---

TABLE 28

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Affective/ Sex Role	Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.71					
	Cold-Warm	-.64					
	Motherly-Fatherly	.46	.32				
	Gentle-Harsh	.45					.37
	Masculine-Feminine	-.36					
Affective/ Consistency	Soft-Hard		.65				
	Unemotional-Emotional	-.30	-.41				
Cognitive	Logical-Illogical			.88			
	Rational-Irrational			.74			
	Careful-Impulsive			.70			
	Analytical-Nonanalytical			.55			
	Childlike-Mature			-.53			
	Confident-Unsure			.46		.39	
	Direct-Evasive		-.34	.42			
	Pleasant-Unpleasant			.39	.35		
Physical Attractiveness	Sexy-Nonsexy				.79		
	Attractive-Unattractive				.78		
	Boring-Interesting				-.38		

Table 28 - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Potency	Submissive-Dominating					-.78	
	Aggressive-Unaggressive					.78	
	Strong-Weak					.61	
	Ambitious-Unambitious					.57	
(Unnamed)	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.37					.57
	Adventurous-Reticent						.46
Sum of Squared Loadings		1.97	1.10	3.19	1.73	2.34	1.00

The correlations and angles between factors are given in Table 29. The largest correlation (.44) is between the Potency and Cognitive factors, indicating a tendency to view a relationship between power and reasoning in the minds of the men responding to the questionnaire.

Comparison between sexes

Table 30 gives a comparison between sexes for the factor patterns for the section of the instrument Women at Work. It is readily apparent that there is considerable agreement on this aspect of women's roles.

The Affective area consists of only one factor for the women while two factors are necessary to explain the variance in the men's answers. Factor I for the males and Factor I for the females have 63 percent of their items in common and a correlation of .83, indicating that the two factors are equivalent. The small male factor in this area does not share a sufficient number of items with the women's Factor I, and therefore the factors are not considered similar.

The largest area for both sexes is the Cognitive which consists of a total of ten items, seven of which are shared in common. The total number of items loading on the area for both groups suggests that both men and women are operating under some form of response set. The fact that the area is cognitive relates to the work situation and suggests that this may be the "set" under which they're operating. A good example of the change in terms is the fact that the "Pleasant-Unpleasant" item loaded almost exclusively on Affective factors in previous analyses yet loads on the Cognitive factor in this case for both men and women. The number of items common to both factors (70 percent) and the .85 correlation lead to the conclusion that these factors are similar.

TABLE 29

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Factor		Factor				
		I	II	III	IV	V
I	Correlation	---				
	Angle	---				
II	Correlation	.28	---			
	Angle	74°	---			
III	Correlation	.18	-.16	---		
	Angle	80°	99°	---		
IV	Correlation	.38	.22	.35	---	
	Angle	68°	77°	70°	---	
V	Correlation	-.10	-.39	.44	.14	---
	Angle	96°	113°	64°	82°	---

TABLE 30

COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings			Percent of Area Item Commonality		Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient	
Affective	Female I	Male I	Male II	FI,MI	FI, MII	FI,MI	FI,MII
Cold-Warm	-.71	-.64	----	63	25	.88	Not Computed
Unemotional-Emotional	-.70	----	-.41				
*Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.69	-.71	----				
Gentle-Harsh	.62	.45	----				
Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.58	----	----				
*Motherly-Fatherly	.51	.46	----				
*Masculine-Feminine	-.43	-.36	----				
*Soft-Hard	.41	----	.65				
Cognitive	Female II	Male III		FII,MIII		FII,MIII	
*Direct-Evasive	.85	.42		70		.85	
*Logical-Illogical	.74	.88					
*Confident-Unsure	.74	.46					
*Rational-Irrational	.68	.74					
*Careful-Impulsive	.60	.70					
*Childlike-Mature	-.59	-.53					
*Ambitious-Unambitious	.47	----					

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

Table 30 - Continued

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings		Percent of Area Item Commonality	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient
Cognitive - Continued)	Female II	Male III		
Pleasant-Unpleasant	.37	.39		
*Adventurous-Reticent	.33	----		
Analytical-Nonanalytical	----	.55		
Physical Attractiveness	Female III	Male IV	FIII,MIV	FIII,MIV
Sexy-Nonsexy	.79	.79	67	.84
*Attractive-Unattractive	.57	.78		
*Boring-Interesting	----	-.38		
Potency	Female IV	Male V	FIV,MV	FIV,MV
*Aggressive-Unaggressive	.74	.78	75	.84
*Submissive-Dominating	-.65	-.78		
*Strong-Weak	.51	.61		
*Ambitious-Unambitious	----	.57		

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

The Physical Attractiveness area for both sexes is very similar, being almost exclusively made up of items denoting physical attractiveness. Of note is the fact that while the "Sexy-Nonsexy" loadings are exactly the same for both men and women, there is some difference in loadings for the "Attractive-Unattractive" item. However, both criterion measures are satisfied, and the factors are considered equivalent.

The Potency factors for both sexes are also very similar, with the same items represented and the loadings for each sex numerically close. The similarity of all the areas indicates agreement on this particular aspect of women's roles.

One difference that appeared is the positive correlation (.44) between the Cognitive and Physical Attractiveness factors for the female subjects and the positive correlation (.44) between Cognitive and Potency factors for male subjects. These women visualized their cognitive aspects as intertwined to a degree with their physical attractiveness while for the men the cognitive area for women at work relates to strength and aggressiveness.

Men At Work

Female subjects

Six factors resulted from the analysis of this section of the instrument, as presented in Table 31. Five are clearly formulated but the sixth is not. The Affective, Cognitive, and Physical Attractiveness areas remained intact and are essentially the same as have appeared in other analyses. The Potency area is essentially the same as has appeared before with one exception--the parental sex-role item does not load here. Instead, it splits off and loads weakly on a factor that does not readily lend itself to interpretation and is omitted from

TABLE 31

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Affective	Gentle-Harsh	.78					
	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.68					
	Cold-Warm	-.68				-.31	
	Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.67					
	Unemotional-Emotional	-.64					
	Soft-Hard	.55					
Cognitive	Logical-Illogical		.67				
	Careful-Impulsive		.63				
	Rational-Irrational		.59				
	Pleasant-Unpleasant	.31	.51				
	Direct-Evasive		.40				
Physical Attractiveness	Attractive-Unattractive			.75			
	Sexy-Nonsexy			.75			
Potency	Aggressive-Unaggressive				.84		
	Strong-Weak				.76		
	Masculine-Feminine				.63		
	Ambitious-Unambitious				.54		
	Adventurous-Reticent				.43		
	Confident-Unsure				.32		

Table 31 - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Maturity	Childlike-Mature					-.65	
	Boring-Interesting					-.49	
(Unnamed)	Dependent-SelfReliant						-.46
	Submissive-Dominating					-.38	-.42
	Analytical-Nonanalytical						.33
	Motherly-Fatherly						.30
Sum of Squared Loadings		3.00	1.99	1.46	2.56	1.29	0.81

analysis. A small Maturity factor appeared in the factor analysis of this section with only two items loading on it.

The correlations and angles between factors are presented in Table 32. The largest correlation between factors is the .41 between the Cognitive and the larger Potency factor suggesting some relationship between cognition and strength in men's role at work.

Male subjects

Although the factor analysis of this section of the instrument for the male subjects produced seven factors, only six are considered interpretable. These factors, together with salient loadings, are given in Table 33. As will be noted, the Cognitive, Affective, and Physical Attractiveness areas remained intact. The Potency area, however, split into two factors. One, a "strength" concept, has the general sex-role item loading on it; the other factor represents a tendency to be outgoing. While the second factor is somewhat speculative, its inclusion in this area is strengthened by the fact that there is a relatively strong positive correlation (.53) between it and the other potency factor. (See Table 34 for all correlations and angles between factors.) A three-item Maturity factor that has the parental sex-role item loading on it also resulted from this analysis.

Comparison between sexes

Table 35 gives a comparison between factor patterns for the two groups. Each general category will be examined separately. The Affective factors for both sexes has 67 percent of their items shared in common and a correlation of .89. Accordingly the factors are considered to be similar. There is a 50 percent commonality for the Cognitive factors for men and women which, coupled with the .80

TABLE 32

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Factor		Factor I	II	III	IV	V
I	Correlation	---				
	Angle	---				
II	Correlation	.00	---			
	Angle	90°	---			
III	Correlation	.20	.29	---		
	Angle	78°	73°	---		
IV	Correlation	-.14	.41	.39	---	
	Angle	98°	66°	67°	---	
V	Correlation	.03	.20	.08	.19	---
	Angle	88°	78°	85°	79°	---

TABLE 33

FACTOR NAMES AND SALIENT FACTOR LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION OF SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings						
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Affective	Unemotional-Emotional	-.65						
	Gentle-Harsh	.48					-.31	
	Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.48						
	Cold-Warm	-.47	-.31					
Cognitive	Logical-Illogical		.65					
	Careful-Impulsive		.63					
	Rational-Irrational		.52					
	Confident-Unsure		.40					
Physical Attractiveness	Attractive-Unattractive			.85				
	Sexy-Nonsexy			.78				
	Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.44		.45				
Potency/ Strength	Strong-Weak				.87			
	Aggressive-Unaggressive				.75			
	Masculine-Feminine				.67			
	Submissive-Dominating				-.46			
Potency/ Outgoing	Direct-Evasive					.69		
	Adventurous-Reticent					.49		
	Ambitious-Unambitious					.33		

Table 33 - Continued

Factor Name	Item	Salient Factor Loadings						
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Maturity	Childlike-Mature		-.45				-.60	
	Soft-Hard	.43					-.56	
	Motherly-Fatherly						-.35	
(Unnamed)	Pleasant-Unpleasant							.56
	Boring-Interesting							-.53
	Analytical-Nonanalytical							.40
	Dependent-SelfReliant							-.34
Sum of Squared Loadings		1.85	1.76	1.71	2.29	1.20	1.22	1.12

TABLE 34

CORRELATIONS AND ANGLES BETWEEN FACTORS FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Factor		Factor					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
I	Correlation	---					
	Angle	---					
II	Correlation	-.03	---				
	Angle	92°	---				
III	Correlation	.35	.14	---			
	Angle	70°	82°	---			
IV	Correlation	.28	.38	-.07	---		
	Angle	74°	68°	94°	---		
V	Correlation	-.04	.28	.16	.53	---	
	Angle	92°	74°	81°	58°	---	
VI	Correlation	-.07	.03	-.08	.22	.16	---
	Angle	94°	88°	95°	97°	81°	---

TABLE 35

COMPARISON OF FACTORS BY MAJOR CATEGORIES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings		Percent of Area Item Commonality	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient
	Female	Male		
Affective	I	I	FI,MI	FI,MI
Gentle-Harsh	.78	.48	67	.89
Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	.68	----		
Cold-Warm	-.68	-.47		
Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	-.67	-.48		
Unemotional-Emotional	-.64	-.65		
Soft-Hard	.55	----		
	Female	Male		
Cognitive	II	II	FII,MII	FII,MII
Logical-Illogical	.67	.65	50	.80
Careful-Impulsive	.63	.63		
Rational-Irrational	.59	.52		
*Pleasant-Unpleasant	.51	----		
*Direct-Evasive	.40	----		
*Confident-Unsure	----	.40		

*z-test between sexes gave $p \leq$ the .01 level for this item.

Table 35 - Continued

Area Item	Salient Factor Loadings			Percent of Area Item Commonality		Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient	
Physical Attractiveness	Female III	Male III		FIII,MIII		FIII,MIII	
*Attractive-Unattractive	.75	.85		67		.77	
*Sexy-Nonsexy	.75	.78					
Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	----	.45					
Potency	Female IV	Male IV	Male V	FIV,MIV	FIV,MV	FIV,MIV	FIV,MV
Aggressive-Unaggressive	.84	.75	----	50	29	.86	Not Computed
Strong-Weak	.76	.87	----				
Masculine-Feminine	.63	.67	----				
*Ambitious-Unambitious	.54	----	.33				
Adventurous-Reticent	.43	----	.49				
*Confident-Unsure	.32	----	----				
*Direct-Evasive	----	----	.69				
Maturity	Female V	Male VI		FV,MVI		FV,MVI	
Childlike-Mature	-.65	-.60		25		Not Computed	
Boring-Interesting	-.49	----					
Soft-Hard	----	-.56					
Motherly-Fatherly	----	-.35					

*z-test between sexes gave p $\leq$ the .01 level for this item.

correlation between the two factors, results in their being declared equivalent. The male and female Physical Attractiveness factors meet both criteria and are therefore equivalent. The Maturity area is common to both groups; however, some differences in structure do appear, raising doubts about the similarity between groups on this aspect of men's roles. While the item "Childlike-Mature" is the largest for both groups, it is the only item shared in common. On the basis of the preceeding, this area cannot be considered equivalent across groups.

Summary

Four areas, Affective, Cognitive, Physical Attractiveness, and Potency appear consistently throughout each section of the instrument. Occasionally, however, another subjects area was necessary to explain all of the factors in each analysis.

In each section only one factor per general area resulted from the analysis of the women's data. However, in many instances three factors resulted. This indicates a narrowing, basic focus on the part of the female subjects while the male subjects tend to discriminate to a greater extent.

The sex-role items either accounted for a factor in and of themselves or loaded on another factor. In the latter instance, it was generally an affective factor for concepts of women's roles and a potency factor for men's roles. This generalization held true for both groups.

Possible explanations for these and other findings are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the results presented in the preceding chapter. The first section considers each research question in light of the findings; the second discusses general conclusions; the third will give recommendations for applying the findings in practice and training; and the fourth presents recommendations for future study.

Research Questions

I. Do men and women differ in their conceptualization of the term "Women"?

Four general areas appeared from the responses of both sexes for this section of the instrument, but the number of factors required to account for the variance differed. In the two areas represented by single factors for both sexes, i.e. Cognitive and Physical Attractiveness, the factors are considered similar based on the criteria set up in Chapter III. However, in the other two areas the responses of the male subjects required more factors than did the responses of the female subjects. Because of these differences, the factor structures for this portion of the instrument are not considered invariant across sex.

II. Do men and women differ in their conceptualization of the term "Men"?

There was more agreement between groups on this section of the instrument. The analysis of the responses of each group produced five general areas. Only one of these areas, Potency, differed between groups again because the area for men split into two factors. One of these male Potency factors is similar to the female factor although the other is not. In spite of the similarities found, according to the criteria set up in Chapter III, the factor structures underlying the responses are not considered the same. However, as the differences are small, they might be a function of the instrument rather than of basic underlying differences. Refinement of the instrument could eliminate these differences.

III. Do men and women differ in their conceptualization of the term "Women at Home"?

There was a greater discrepancy on this section of the instrument than on any other. Six different areas resulted, but only four of them were common to both groups. There was basic agreement on the Cognitive and Physical Attractiveness areas as both required single factors and there was similarity between the groups on the makeup of these factors.

The Affective area split into two factors for men while remaining intact for women. The larger male factor, Factor I, did reach equivalency with the one female factor, but the second one did not. Because of the difference in number of factors, it is assumed that male subjects viewed this area on a more complex level than did female subjects.

While there was single factors for both groups in the Potency realm and both groups agreed on the heaviest-loading terms, many more items loaded on this factor for females than did for males, resulting in a much larger factor for females. Some of the items that loaded on

Potency for females split and made a separate Outgoing Personality factor for males. An examination of these items reveals that they are more reminiscent of an adventurous personality than of potency. If one were to consider this factor in light of the dimensions commonly used with semantic differential scales, i.e., evaluative, potency, and activity, the three items that load in common would represent the potency dimension. However, the extra items that load for the female subjects are evaluative in nature. Osgood *et al.*, (1957) offer the suggestion that interaction between the concept (in this case Women at Home) and the scales used in semantic differential analysis can occur. When this interaction does happen, the following general hypothesis appears to hold: "In the process of human judgment, all scales tend to shift in meaning toward parallelism with the dominant (characteristic) attribute of the concept being judged" (Osgood et al., 1975, p. 187). If this is true, then the women responding to this section of the instrument consider potency to be the "dominant attribute" of their role at home. It would appear that this belief does not hold true for the men who participated in the study. In separating the two areas, the men extrapolated to a different level than did the women rather than having the extra items load on the Potency factor.

A possible reason for these women considering potency as their dominant characteristic at home is their wish to identify with strength rather than weakness. An early result of the women's movement was to declare the homemaker as a subordinate to her husband who had limited power. This view of the woman in the home has changed greatly because women have rebelled against it and have pointed out the strength inherent in this aspect of their role as women.

A separate Sex Role area appeared for the women. The general sex-role item, while loading on this factor, also loaded on the Affective factor and on the Potency factor as well, indicating a possible blurring of the differences between the areas. The negative sign with the "Soft-Hard" item in Factor V is a reversal of this item from the previous analysis of the section Women as responded to by female subjects. This indicates a positive relationship between "feminine" and "hard" rather than a negative one as had previously been found. This appears to reiterate the finding presented in a previous paragraph, that women identify their overall sex role with strength. Another possible explanation for this ambivalance that suggests itself is that these are college women, most are unmarried, and they are focused on the career aspects of their lives and may not be entirely clear about their role "at home." Another consideration is the general confusion that the women's liberation movement may have created about this aspect of women's lives. Much of the focus of this movement has been on women entering the work force rather than remaining at home. This, too, may have generated ambivalance in the minds of the women who participated in this study. There is the possibility that there are two (or more) divergent beliefs underlying this area and that the women cannot be considered as a single group unto themselves but rather as subgroups with differing views. A Q factor analysis of the responses of the women in this area would perhaps determine if this is true.

Because of the many differences in factor structure, this section of the instrument cannot be considered invariant across groups.

IV. Do men and women differ in their conceptualization of the term "Men at Home"?

There was agreement between the groups in the three areas Cognitive, Potency, and Sex Role on this section of the instrument as both criteria for similarity were met, and each area was declared equivalent across sex. There were some differences, however. The Affective area for men split into two factors with only one of these factors matching the one female factor.

The women again had items pertaining to an "outgoing personality" loading on another factor although in this case it was the Physical Attractiveness factor rather than Potency as was the case for the previous section. The men separated these items into two separate factors, one relating to physical attractiveness and the other to outgoing personality. Based on the differences cited above, the factor structures of these groups are not considered invariant on this particular aspect of men's roles.

V. Do men and women differ in their conceptualization of the term "Women at Work"?

There was considerable agreement on this aspect of women's roles. Three of the four areas that resulted from the analyses were considered equivalent across groups. The fourth area, Affective, had two factors for men and only one for women. However, the larger male factor was similar to the female factor although the smaller one was not.

Both groups had Inordinately large Cognitive factors in comparison to those found previously. A response set appeared to be operating for both groups, and many evaluative-type items which had loaded on other factors for other sections of the instrument piled on this factor.

Concept-scale interaction would account for the response set operating for both groups on this section of the instrument as cognition would seem to be the dominant area when the work mileau is considered.

Although the factor structures cannot be considered invariant because of the differing levels of discrimination on the Affective area, there is strong agreement between the two groups on this particular aspect of women's roles. Again refinement of the instrument could establish if there is really a difference in level of conceptualization of the role or if this apparent difference is merely a function of instrument instability.

VI. Do men and women differ in their conceptualization of the term "Men at Work"?

Five areas resulted for both groups from the analyses of this section of the instrument. Three of these, the Affective, Cognitive, and Physical Attractiveness areas, were similar across groups. The Potency area was made up of two factors for male subjects and only one for females. The larger of the two Potency factors for men equated with the Potency factor for women, but the smaller did not. Again there was a separativeness in this area in the responses of the men that did not appear in those of the women.

Although they were not found to be similar, a Maturity factor separated out for both groups. As a result of this and the other differences found, the factor structures of the two groups cannot be considered invariant.

General Findings

Two basic, underlying findings stand out from all others. First, men consistently viewed the different aspects of sex roles on a different level than did women. In every section the responses of the women produced areas made up of single factors while those of the men had at least one area that split into two factors. Second, with little exception, the two items that pertain specifically to sexual identification, i.e., "Masculine-Feminine" and "Motherly-Fatherly," loaded on an affective-type factor for women's roles and a potency-related one for men's roles. A more detailed discussion of these findings follows.

General Finding Number 1

As previously stated, the men's data consistently produced more factors than did the women's data. This indicates that the men in this sample viewed the sex-role conceptualizations presented to them on a more complex level. This difference in complexity could be caused by the lack of opportunity for women to acquire more breadth for their viewpoints. Sex-role stereotyping has resulted in a narrowing of possibilities for women that may have translated into a narrowness of understanding. Men, however, have been allowed to sample all aspects of a broad, rich culture thus permitting them to manifest a plethoric view of life.

General Finding Number 2

This finding reiterates on a basic, conceptual level the belief that women interact in life in a feeling manner while men's basic makeup is intrinsically tied in with strength and power. This verification of a common conception of sex roles is particularly important in that the complexity of factor analysis precludes the possibility of subjects influencing the results without some indication of the effort, thus lending credence to this finding. In terms of application, if both men and women believe that their sex roles are a function of a single influence, they will act and respond to others on this level, thus blocking possibilities for change.

Recommendations for Application of Findings

In order to be meaningful, the findings in this study must lead to more effective measures for helping men and women to understand their roles as men and women. One way that this can be achieved is for counselors to help them to an understanding of the ways in which confining roles to one general aspect (i.e., men to strength, women to feeling) precludes the full development of their personalities. Further, it limits them to a stereotypic view of themselves and others and prohibits an interaction with others based on a realization of their instinsic, individual attributes.

That most of the women who participated in this study failed to discriminate in aspects of sex roles as widely as did the men was pointed out by the results. When counselors interact with clients, they should be aware of this finding and be alert to the possibility of the presence of this problem. The client who manifests this narrowness of focus should be made aware of it and, if desired, helped to understand and counter it.

With measurement instruments it is often advantageous to use subscale scores rather than total scale scores because the former identify abilities on a trait level while the latter produce more abstract findings (Guertin & Bailey, 1970). Factor analysis would most properly be used to verify subscale scores used in these instruments. If an instrument is claimed to measure potency, affective, and cognitive domains, then a factor analysis based on data from such an instrument should reproduce these areas as factors, i.e., items that are added to produce a potency subscale should load on a potency factor and so forth for the other areas. If factors differ for subgroups using an ins-rument, then the subscales and their meanings differ, and the subgroups should not be compared on these traits.

The lack of invariance in factor structure identified in this study revealed underlying differences in the perceptions of the two groups used. This difference is most evident in the section of the instrument used in this study entitled Women at Home. While the groups agreed on three of the areas underlying this aspect of women's roles, they differed on others even to the extent that each group produced an area that wasn't present for the other. Comparison of these groups on a potency subscale, for instance, could lead to erroneous results because the makeup of this particular area differs markedly between the two groups. Before comparisons can be made on this subscale, these differences must be eliminated. Other instruments pertaining to sex roles that use subscale scores, most notably the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI), must have the validity of the factors underlying these scores verified to determine if they hold across all possible groups used. Until this verification is carried out, research based on this instrument is open to doubt. The one factor analysis of the BSRI that was reported on in Chapter II had several procedural problems that tend to nullify the results presented.

Persons who train counselors should be made aware of not only the findings in this study but also of findings in other studies that pertain to sex roles and their stereotyping. Many college departments who train those in the helping professions have developed courses pertaining to sex roles, but often these are in Women's Studies Programs and present only those aspects that apply to women. While this addresses part of the problem, it does little to alert the neophyte counselor to the problems that men fact. A course that covers both aspects of sex roles would seem more meaningful.

Also, the instructors who teach courses in measurement and evaluation should be alert to the possible problems with the factorial validity of the instruments about which they teach. Emphasis should be placed on instructing their students about redimentary factor analysis and its application to testing instruments.

Recommendations for Further Study

The first recommendation pertains to the instrument itself. An item analysis that will ascertain the items that tend to load on the same area across sections of the instrument for both groups should be carried out. This would allow for refinement of the instrument and a more meaningful comparison of the factor structures should result when the instrument is used in future studies.

One item that has arisen from this study is the tendency of the data of the male subjects to produce more factors per area than appear from the data of the female subjects. Is this difference a result of (1) this specific subject area, i.e., sex roles, (2) this specific population of college males, (3) or is it a universal finding that will hold across most constructs used? Further studies using different populations and/or different constructs should serve to establish the extent of this variation.

Why was there ambivalence about the "Masculine-Feminine" item in the responses of the female subjects on the section of the instrument Women at Home? Further studies using college women and studies using other populations should ascertain if this resulted from: (1) ambivalance caused by career-oriented women considering their role at home, (2) a general confusion in the minds of the women perhaps caused by the feminist movement, (3) two or more different subgroups of women or (4) this being an artifact of this particular data.

This instrument or a similar one should be modified to be used with young children to determine, if possible, the age that the sex-role items begin to load on different factors for males' and females' roles. An answer to this question could help determine the point at which an intervention to prevent the development of sex-role stereotyping would be most effective.

In some ways the basic question underlying this study, i.e., do men and women differ on aspects of some construct, represents a stereotypic viewpoint in and of itself by assuming that women might answer as one group and men might answer as another, separate group. While the findings of this study are helpful in that they have verified that there can be differences in basic understanding between two subgroups that are often compared on some variable, they are only the first step in a lengthy process. It would seem that the next step is to ascertain if humans should indeed be divided into male/female subgroups or perhaps by another classification such as masculine/feminine/androgynous. Although the factor loadings in this particular study were satisfactory, would they be higher, thus indicating more agreement among subjects, if abstractions based on a categorization that may not hold true were rejected? Q analysis, which intercorrelates people rather than items, would appear to be most helpful to answer this question. A program developed by Guertin and Bailey (1970) that develops profiles that

that discriminate both as to shape and level offers interesting prospects in this area. The instrument used in this study should lend itself well to this particular type of analysis.

REFERENCES

Amundsen, Kirsten. A New Look at the Silenced Majority. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Bardwick, Judith M., & Douvan, Elizabeth. Ambivalence: The socialization of women. In Vivian Gornick & Barbara K. Moran (Eds.), Woman in Sexist Society. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1972.

Bem, Sandra L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42(2), 155-162.

Bernstein, Jean. The elementary school: Training ground for sex role stereotypes. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1972, 51(2), 97-101.

Boyle, M. Barbara. Equal opportunity for women is smart business. Harvara Business Review, May-June 1973, pp. 85-95.

Bradshaw, Thomas F., & Stinson, John F. Trends in weekly earnings: An analysis. Monthly Labor Review, 1975, 98(8), 22-32.

Brenton, Myron. The American Male. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1966.

Broverman, Inge K., Broverman, Donald M., & Clarkson, Frank E. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34(1), 1-7.

Broverman, Inge K., Vogel, Susan Raymond, Broverman, Donald M., Clarkson, Frank E., & Rosenkrantz, Paul S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28(2), 59-78.

Brown, Gary D. Discrimination and pay disparities between white men and women. Monthly Labor Review, 1978, 101(3), 17-22.

Cecil, Earl A., Paul, Robert J., & Olins, Robert A. Perceived importance of selected variables used to evaluate male and female job applicants. Personnel Psychology, 1973, 26, 397-404.

Cole, Nancy S., & Hanson, Gary R. Impact of interest inventories on career choice. In Esther E. Diamond (Ed.), Issues of Sex Bias and Sex Fairness in Career Interest Measurement. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1975.

Cooley, William W., & Lohnes, Paul R. Multivariate Data Analysis. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.

Cosentino, Fred, & Heilbrun, Alfred B., Jr. Anxiety correlates of sex-role identity in college students. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 729-730.

Deutsch, Connie J., & Gilbert, Lucia A. Sex role stereotypes: Effect on perceptions of self and others and on personal adjustment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23(4), 373-379.

English, Horace B., & English, Ava C. A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1958.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. Personality Structure and Measurement. San Diego, CA: Robert R. Knapp, 1969.

Fretz, C. F., & Hayman, Joanne. Progress for women--men are still more equal. Harvard Business Review, September-October 1973, pp. 133-142.

Gaudreau, Patrice. Factor analysis of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 45(2), 299-302.

Green, Richard. Children's quest for sexual identity. Psychology Today, 1974, 7(9), 45-51.

Guertin, Wilson H., & Bailey, John P., Jr. Introduction to Modern Factor Analysis. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1970.

Guertin, Wilson H., & Jourard, Sidney M. Characteristics of real-self-ideal-self discrepancy scores revealed by factor analysis. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26(3), 241-245.

Gump, Janice Porter. Sex-role attitudes and psychological well-being. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28(2), 79-92.

Hennig, Margaret, & Jardim, Anne. The Managerial Woman. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977.

Hillman, Judith Stevinson. Occupational roles in children's literature. Elementary School Journal, 1976, 77(1), 1-4.

Katzenmeyer, W. G., & Stenner, A. Jackson. Estimation of the invariance of factor structures across sex and race with implications for hypothesis testing. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1977, 37, 111-119.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In Eleanor E. Maccoby (Ed.), The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Komarovsky, Mirra. Patterns of self-disclosure in male undergraduates. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 677-687.

Lakoff, Robin. You are what you say. Ms Magazine, July 1974, pp. 65-67.

Lee, Patrick C. Reinventing sex roles in the early childhood setting. Childhood Education, 1976, 52(4), 187-191.

Lewis, M. Parents and children: Sex-role development. School Review, 1972, 80(2), 229-240.

Levy, Betty. Do teachers sell girls short? Today's Education, 1972, 61(9), 27-31.

Loring, Rosalind, & Wells, Theodora. Breakthrough: Women into Management. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1972.

McCune, Shirley D., & Matthews, Martha. Building positive futures: Toward a nonsexist education for all children. Childhood Education, 1976, 52(4), 179-186.

Mischel, Walter. A social-learning view of sex differences in behavior. In Eleanor E. Maccoby (Ed.), The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Oakley, Ann. Sex, Gender and Society. London: Temple Smith, 1972.

Osgood, Charles, Suci, George J., Tannenbaum, Percy H. The Measurement of Meaning. Chicago, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Pierce, Christin. Natural law language and women. In Vivian Gornick & Barbara K. Moran (Eds.), Woman in Sexist Society. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971.

Pleck, Joseph H. The male sex role: Definitions, problems, and sources of change. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32(3), 155-163.

Report of the Task Force on Sex Bias and Sex-role Stereotyping in Psychotherapeutic Practice. American Psychologist, 1975, 40(2), 1169-1175.

Rosen, Benson, & Jerdee, Thomas H. Sex stereotyping in the executive suite. Harvard Business Review, March-April 1974, pp. 45-58.

Rummel, R. J. Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Schlossberg, N., & Pietrofesa, J. Perspectives on counseling bias: Implications for counselor education. The Counseling Psychologist, 1973, 4, 44-53.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conception of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.

Stewig, John Warren, & Knipfel, Mary Lynn. Sexism in picture books: What progress? Elementary School Journal, 1975, 76(3), 151-155.

Stewig, John Warren, & Higgs, Margaret. Girls grow up to be mommies: Sexism in picture books. School Library Journal, 1973, 19(1), 44-49.

Stone, L. Joseph, & Church, Joseph. Childhood and Adolescence (2nd. Ed.). New York: Random House, 1968.

Strainchamps, Ethel. Our sexist language. In Vivian Gornick & Barbara K. Moran (Eds.), Woman in Sexist Society. New York: Basic, Books, Inc., 1971.

Waldman, Elizabeth, & McEaddy, Beverly J. Where women work--An analysis by industry and occupation. Monthly Labor Review, 1974, 97(5), 3-13.

Wells, Theodora. Handling sexism at work: Nondefensive communication. In Rosalind Loring & Herbert Otto (Eds), New Life Options: The Working Woman's Resource Book. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Westervelt, E. M. A tide in the affairs of women: The psychological impact of feminism on educated women. In Lenore W. Harmon, Janice M. Birk, Laurine E. Fitzgerald, & Mary Faith Tanney (Eds.), Counseling Women. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1978.

Williams, John E., & Best, Deborah L. Sex stereotypes and trait favorability on the Adjective Check List. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1977, 37, 101-110.

APPENDIX A

INFORMATION ON PILOT STUDY

INITIAL INSTRUMENT

(Concept)

AGGRESSIVE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNAGGRESSIVE
SOFT_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____HARD
STRONG_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____WEAK
ACTIVE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____PASSIVE
SUBMISSIVE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____DOMINANT
CONFORMING_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____COMPETITIVE
MASCULINE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____FEMININE
TIMID_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ASSERTIVE
SELF-RELIANT_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____DEPENDENT
AFFECTIONATE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____NONDEMONSTRATIVE
ANALYTICAL_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____NONANALYTICAL
SENSITIVE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____INSENSITIVE
COLD_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____WARM
EMOTIONAL_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNEMOTIONAL
ADVENTUROUS_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____RETICENT
AMBITIOUS_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNAMBITIOUS
GENTLE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____HARSH
MOTHERLY_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____FATHERLY
UNSYMPATHETIC_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____SYMPATHETIC
ATTRACTIVE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNATTRACTIVE
CHILDLIKE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____MATURE
CONFIDENT_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNSURE
SEXY_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____NONSEXY
CHARMING_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____OFFENSIVE
DIRECT_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____EVASIVE
CAREFUL_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____IMPULSIVE
LOGICAL_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ILLOGICAL
PLEASANT_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNPLEASANT
INTERESTING_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____BORING
NAIVE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____SOPHISTICATED
RATIONAL_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____IRRATIONAL
LATE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____PROMPT

TABLE 36

BREAKDOWN OF SUBJECTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE PILOT STUDY BY SEX, CLASSIFICATION, RACE, AND AREA

	Classification				
	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Total
Men	3	13	6	15	37
Women	0	4	5	14	23
Total	3	17	11	29	60

	Race			
	Caucasian	Black	Spanish	Total
Men	35	1	1	37
Women	20	2	1	23
Total	55	3	2	60

	Area			
	Graduate Counseling	Engineering	EDC 450	Total
Men	12	21	4	37
Women	14	1	8	23
Total	26	22	12	60

TABLE 37

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EACH ITEM ON INITIAL INSTRUMENT

		Concepts											
		Women		Men		Women at Home		Men at Home		Women at Work		Men at Work	
Item	Group	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Aggressive-Unaggressive	Men	4.62	1.14	2.43	0.80	4.16	1.52	3.76	1.55	2.65	0.95	2.24	0.86
	Women	4.22	1.24	2.39	0.84	4.22	1.56	4.26	1.42	2.61	0.94	2.09	0.95
Soft-Hard	Men	2.67	1.07	4.92	0.89	2.95	1.29	3.92	1.40	3.86	1.32	5.24	0.76
	Women	3.09	0.95	4.78	1.20	2.70	1.40	3.26	1.10	4.13	1.18	5.09	1.38
Strong-Weak	Men	4.14*	1.11	2.65	1.01	3.89	1.37	3.05	1.37	3.16*	1.04	2.35	0.86
	Women	3.39	1.44	3.13	1.14	3.35	1.53	3.59	1.47	2.52	1.08	2.26	1.01
Active-Passive	Men	3.62	1.30	2.59	1.04	3.32	1.33	3.32	1.29	2.59*	0.92	2.40	0.83
	Women	2.96	1.30	2.57	1.08	3.43	1.65	3.78	1.44	1.96	0.88	2.09	1.08
Submissive-Dominant	Men	3.16*	1.19	5.30	0.84	3.51	1.15	4.81*	1.27	4.89	0.84	5.54	1.02
	Women	3.91	1.16	5.21	1.04	4.04	1.33	3.95	1.21	4.87	1.01	5.52	1.08
Conforming-Competitive	Men	3.62	1.19	5.08	1.48	3.19	1.05	3.86	1.40	4.97	1.21	5.27	1.56
	Women	3.74	1.29	5.34	1.36	3.26	1.36	3.96	1.40	5.30	1.46	5.42	1.24
Masculine-Feminine	Men	5.86	1.25	1.92	0.98	5.70	1.15	2.46*	1.17	4.86	1.46	2.16	1.04
	Women	5.39	1.23	2.13	1.18	5.17	1.59	3.09	1.16	4.74	1.57	2.17	1.27
Timid-Assertive	Men	3.95	1.23	5.27	1.02	4.05	1.18	4.84	1.26	5.32	0.85	5.32	0.97
	Women	4.35	1.03	5.30	1.18	4.09	1.24	4.48	1.44	5.74	0.69	5.78	1.17
SelfReliant-Dependent	Men	4.24	1.21	2.86	1.21	3.89	1.54	3.70	1.65	3.35	1.53	2.59	1.17
	Women	4.09	1.44	2.65	1.19	4.48	1.53	4.00	1.38	2.30	1.40	2.13	0.97

*t-test between sexes gave p>.05 for this item.

TABLE 37 - (Continued)

		Concepts											
		Women		Men		Women at Home		Men at Home		Women at Work		Men at Work	
Item	Group	Mean.	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Affectionate-	Men	2.78	1.13	3.43*	1.17	2.73	1.22	3.11	1.17	4.35	1.58	4.05	1.37
Nondemonstrative	Women	2.30	1.18	4.35	1.50	2.52	1.50	3.00	1.28	3.91	1.41	4.61	1.47
Analytical-	Men	4.76	1.28	2.81	1.08	4.46	1.41	3.13	1.23	3.24	1.23	2.62	1.19
Nonanalytical	Women	4.21	1.41	2.91	1.34	4.00	1.38	3.56	1.24	2.96	1.15	2.43	1.24
Sensitive-	Men	2.38	1.09	3.49	1.15	2.27	1.07	3.11	1.24	3.57	1.32	4.00	1.25
Insensitive	Women	2.65	1.33	3.65	1.19	2.35	1.11	3.35	1.15	2.96	1.02	4.30	1.29
Cold-	Men	4.78	1.46	4.40	1.07	5.65	1.06	5.03	1.21	4.23	1.31	3.81	1.17
Warm	Women	5.13	1.14	4.96	0.93	5.48	1.20	5.04	1.15	4.78	1.04	3.87	1.18
Emotional-	Men	2.30	1.05	4.00	1.08	2.59	1.17	3.51	1.24	3.49	1.24	4.30	1.17
Unemotional	Women	2.26	1.01	4.26	1.42	2.48	1.04	3.39	1.20	3.56	1.27	4.91	1.44
Adventurous-	Men	3.76	1.19	2.68	1.06	4.35	1.44	3.51	1.43	3.16	1.04	2.97	1.17
Reticent	Women	4.00	1.41	2.74	1.25	4.30	1.55	4.26	1.39	2.74	1.05	2.83	1.50
Ambitious-	Men	3.73	0.93	2.46	0.99	4.19	1.45	3.38	1.38	2.46	0.77	2.22	0.98
Unambitious	Women	3.26	1.51	2.61	1.16	4.17	1.75	4.26	1.45	2.13	1.06	1.91	1.00
Gentle-	Men	2.73	1.24	3.78	1.23	2.65	1.30	3.40	1.30	3.76	1.23	4.30	1.08
Harsh	Women	2.61	1.03	3.43	1.04	2.78	1.17	3.09	1.08	3.35	0.93	4.26	0.96
Motherly-	Men	2.30	1.05	5.68	1.08	1.81	0.88	5.68	1.08	3.46	1.09	4.84	1.01
Fatherly	Women	2.35	1.15	5.48	1.20	2.09	1.38	5.26	1.29	3.48	0.95	4.96	1.02

*t-test between sexes gave p>.05 for this item.

TABLE 37 - (Continued)

Item	Group	Concepts											
		Women		Men		Women at Home		Men at Home		Women at Work		Men at Work	
		Mean.	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Unsympathetic-	Men	5.19	1.17	4.57	1.14	5.59	1.17	4.86	1.34	4.51	1.28	4.05	1.47
Sympathetic	Women	5.30	0.97	4.96	1.11	5.56	1.08	4.78	1.13	4.91	0.85	4.39	0.84
Attractive-	Men	2.40	1.04	3.68	1.45	2.95	1.20	3.76	1.61	2.65	1.27	3.65*	1.42
Unattractive	Women	2.87	1.01	2.74	1.32	3.30	1.40	3.52	1.41	2.74	1.42	2.96	0.98
Childlike-	Men	4.13	1.38	4.84	0.90	4.68	1.31	4.92	1.16	5.08	1.14	5.25	0.97
Mature	Women	4.18	1.47	4.52	1.08	4.09	1.20	3.65	1.26	5.22	1.17	4.91	1.04
Confident-	Men	3.95	1.39	3.13	1.06	3.38	1.28	3.40	1.57	2.89	1.17	2.65	1.18
Unsure	Women	3.56	1.53	3.09	1.20	3.65	1.64	3.74	1.57	2.43	0.79	2.35	0.98
Sexy-	Men	2.24*	1.01	4.11*	1.58	3.05	1.20	4.00	1.43	2.81*	1.24	3.89	1.39
Nonsexy	Women	2.96	0.88	3.04	1.06	3.65	1.40	3.48	1.27	3.48	0.99	3.43	0.84
Charming-	Men	2.89	1.14	3.73*	1.07	3.11	1.15	3.95	1.18	3.22	1.18	3.59	1.19
Offensive	Women	3.17	1.15	3.04	1.06	3.35	1.15	3.52	0.79	3.30	1.02	3.61	0.84
Direct-	Men	4.22	1.63	2.97	1.14	3.73	1.37	3.11	1.20	3.05	1.31	2.73	1.24
Evasive	Women	3.91	1.68	2.91	1.20	3.43	1.44	3.78	1.35	2.74	1.18	2.77	1.19
Careful-	Men	3.95	1.37	3.54	1.22	3.35	1.36	3.46	1.35	3.22	1.34	2.84	1.19
Impulsive	Women	4.17	1.53	3.43	1.38	3.09	1.53	3.26	1.25	2.96	1.19	3.09	1.41
Logical-	Men	4.57*	1.35	2.92	1.14	3.95*	1.22	2.97	1.08	3.46	1.41	2.68	1.16
Illogical	Women	3.61	1.47	2.78	1.24	3.26	1.29	3.30	1.06	3.04	1.15	2.52	1.16

*t-test between sexes gave p>.05 for this item.

TABLE 37 - (Continued)

Item	Group	Concepts											
		Women		Men		Women at Home		Men at Home		Women at Work		Men at Work	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Pleasant-Unpleasant	Men	2.68	1.06	3.24	1.01	2.89	0.99	3.27	1.15	3.05	1.20	3.46	1.19
	Women	2.78	1.17	3.13	0.92	3.00	1.21	3.22	1.20	2.91	1.00	3.48	0.95
Interesting-Boring	Men	2.57	1.28	3.13	1.21	3.51	1.43	3.40	1.19	2.97	1.30	2.95	1.13
	Women	3.17	1.37	2.61	1.20	4.00	1.35	3.78	1.62	2.65	0.83	2.74	1.14
Naive-Sophisticated	Men	3.92	1.34	4.51	0.90	4.05	1.18	4.51	1.10	4.84	1.21	4.81	1.10
	Women	4.09	0.85	4.48	0.79	3.83	1.11	4.00	0.85	5.17	1.07	4.83	0.89
Rational-Irrational	Men	4.16	1.26	2.89	0.94	4.00	1.25	3.11	1.05	3.43*	1.38	2.59	1.09
	Women	3.70	1.29	3.00	1.21	3.61	1.16	3.13	1.32	2.65	0.88	2.65	1.11
Late-Prompt	Men	3.43*	1.09	4.19	1.05	4.03	1.04	4.03*	1.04	4.73	1.19	4.73	1.15
	Women	4.13	1.32	4.13	1.39	4.39	1.16	4.39	1.03	4.91	1.28	4.87	1.10

*t-test between sexes gave p>.05 for this item.

TABLE 38

RELIABILITY DATA ON INITIAL INSTRUMENT - CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PRE-POST ADMINISTRATIONS

(All figures were multiplied by 100)

Item	Concept					
	Women	Men	Women at Home	Men at Home	Women at Work	Men at Work
Aggressive-Unaggressive	59*	72*	62*	69*	85*	60*
Soft-Hard	62*	75*	72*	67*	50*	61*
Strong-Hard	61*	42*	74*	79*	81*	66*
Active-Passive	24	82*	74*	58*	80*	79*
Submissive-Dominant	32	48*	48*	77*	67*	82*
Conforming-Competitive	51*	54*	46*	27	78*	33
Masculine-Feminine	63*	63*	68*	68*	77*	79*
Timid-Assertive	23	35	70*	77*	54*	35
SelfReliant-Dependent	39	69*	78*	58*	52*	76*
Affectionate-Nondemonstrative	74*	50*	69*	71*	75*	49*
Analytical-Nonanalytical	61*	44*	71*	44*	67*	87*
Sensitive-Insensitive	71*	11	81*	75*	64*	69*

*P>.05

TABLE 38 - (Continued)

Item	Concept					
	Women	Men	Women at Home	Men at Home	Women at Work	Men at Work
Cold-Warm	54*	55*	83*	74*	72*	71*
Emotional-Unemotional	58*	66*	72*	50*	18	73*
Adventurous-Reticent	66*	76*	69*	73*	83*	88*
Ambitious-Unambitious	55*	74*	69*	91*	47*	42*
Gentle-Harsh	76*	58*	75*	86*	74*	66*
Motherly-Fatherly	64*	70*	75*	58*	88*	80*
Unsympathetic-Sympathetic	70*	51*	80*	80*	72*	72*
Attractive-Unattractive	65*	58*	75*	92*	69*	93*
Childlike-Mature	72*	65*	77*	55*	64*	61*
Confident-Unsure	60*	78*	76*	76*	78*	72*
Sexy-Nonsexy	53*	76*	87*	75*	79*	82*
Charming-Offensive	71*	52*	67*	80*	85*	86*
Direct-Evasive	66*	78*	69*	77*	75*	89*
Careful-Impulsive	77*	74*	46*	61*	87*	79*

*P>.05

TABLE 38 - (Continued)

Item	Concept					
	Women	Men	Women at Home	Men at Home	Women at Work	Men at Work
Logical-Illogical	78*	77*	84*	68*	80*	88*
Pleasant-Unpleasant	73*	80*	82*	72*	85*	73*
Interesting-Boring	88*	65*	78*	73*	74*	73*
Naive-Sophisticated	43*	59*	65*	79*	81*	85*
Rational-Irrational	74*	63*	87*	78*	83*	88*
Late-Prompt	80*	65*	87*	27	61*	69*

*P>.05

APPENDIX B

FINAL INSTRUMENT

Dear Student:

The purpose of this study is to assess your opinions about males and females and some of their roles in terms of descriptive words. In taking this inventory, please make your judgements on the basis of what these things mean to you. On each page of this booklet, you will find a different concept and beneath it a set of words. You are to rate the concept on each of these in order.

Here is how you use this inventory:

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair __✓__:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ unfair

OR

fair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:__✓__ unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

strong _____:__✓__:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ weak

OR

strong _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:__✓__:_____ weak

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

active _____:_____:__✓__:_____:_____:_____:_____ passive

OR

active _____:_____:_____:_____:__✓__:_____:_____ passive

Your check-mark, of course, depends upon your evaluation of the thing you're judging.

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale (both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept), you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

safe _____:_____:_____:__✓__:_____:_____:_____ dangerous

PLEASE NOTE:
1. Place your check-marks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries.
2. Be sure you check every scale for every concept--do not omit any.
3. Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Work at fairly high speed through this inventory. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items that are important.

Before starting the inventory itself, please answer a few questions about yourself. When you have filled in the items below, turn to the next page and begin the inventory. Please be assured that your responses on this inventory will be confidential. Participation is voluntary, and your completion of this instrument will be the indication of your consent to participate.

Thank you for your assistance.

SEX: _____Male

_____Female

YEAR IN COLLEGE: _____Freshman

_____Sophomore

_____Junior

_____Senior

_____Other:_________

MAJOR: ________________________________ AGE:___________________

RACE: _____Caucasian

_____Black

_____Other:_________________

APPROXIMATE GPA AT END OF LAST QUARTER:___________

FINAL INSTRUMENT

(Concept)

AGGRESSIVE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNAGGRESSIVE
STRONG_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____WEAK
SUBMISSIVE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____DOMINATING
MASCULINE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____FEMININE
AFFECTIONATE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____NONDEMONSTRATIVE
ANALYTICAL_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____NONANALYTICAL
COLD_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____WARM
ADVENTUROUS_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____RETICENT
GENTLE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____HARSH
MOTHERLY_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____FATHERLY
UNSYMPATHETIC_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____SYMPATHETIC
ATTRACTIVE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNATTRACTIVE
CHILDLIKE_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____MATURE
CONFIDENT_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNSURE
SEXY_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____NONSEXY
DIRECT_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____EVASIVE
CAREFUL_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____IMPULSIVE
LOGICAL_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ILLOGICAL
PLEASANT_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNPLEASANT
BORING_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____INTERESTING
RATIONAL_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____IRRATIONAL
DEPENDENT_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____SELF-RELIANT
AMBITIOUS_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____UNAMBITIOUS
SOFT_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____HARD
UNEMOTIONAL_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____EMOTIONAL

APPENDIX C

COMPLETE FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS

TABLE 39

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

	Factor				
Item	I	II	III	IV	V
1	.10	.02	.00	.83	-.18
2	-.03	.11	.04	.53	.12
3	.00	.12	.03	-.35	-.40
4	-.38	-.23	-.10	.16	.12
5	.50	-.01	.22	.03	-.02
6	-.02	.13	.25	.17	.13
7	-.46	-.13	.06	.14	-.47
8	.02	.19	.30	.39	.27
9	.49	.07	.22	.02	.31
10	.53	-.11	.19	-.06	-.06
11	-.74	-.14	.12	-.07	-.11
12	.13	-.01	.61	.14	-.11
13	-.06	-.59	-.16	-.05	.17
14	-.13	.35	.30	.26	.18
15	.09	-.11	.76	.01	-.07
16	-.19	.24	.21	.00	.40
17	-.03	.69	-.14	-.08	.05
18	.05	.72	-.09	.04	.09
19	.26	.22	.42	-.11	.19
20	.08	-.12	-.62	-.01	-.16
21	-.04	.63	.06	.18	-.03
22	.26	-.14	-.22	-.11	-.10
23	.10	.33	.20	.23	.18
24	.44	-.06	.41	-.16	.05
25	-.70	.08	.02	-.14	.07

TABLE 40

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Item	Factor						
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1	-.08	-.06	-.07	.05	.05	.60	-.05
2	-.08	-.13	-.02	-.01	.33	.24	.12
3	.18	-.06	.23	.13	.08	-.16	-.39
4	-.62	.04	.05	-.01	-.03	-.05	.11
5	.36	.17	-.12	.45	.00	.09	.12
6	.03	.24	.45	-.20	.01	.48	-.03
7	-.46	.02	.02	-.03	-.36	.08	-.20
8	-.03	-.02	.13	.16	.23	.37	.25
9	.34	.31	.22	.16	-.06	-.04	.20
10	.58	.16	.00	-.12	-.03	-.14	.13
11	-.22	-.17	-.05	-.14	-.27	.09	-.19
12	-.08	.08	.04	.68	.04	-.06	-.18
13	-.07	.13	-.34	.03	-.23	.09	-.28
14	.20	-.02	.34	.09	.15	.38	.09
15	-.05	.13	-.08	.73	-.03	.11	-.01
16	.15	.04	.43	.05	-.21	.10	.31
17	-.09	.05	.63	-.06	.09	-.02	-.18
18	-.03	-.11	.79	.00	-.01	-.01	.13
19	.01	.22	.18	.41	.25	-.15	.12
20	-.10	-.06	-.15	-.20	-.48	.08	.01
21	.04	-.19	.67	.10	.16	.03	.04
22	.08	.04	-.05	.04	-.11	.05	-.40
23	.06	.08	.03	-.02	.63	.31	-.03
24	.03	.62	.00	.34	-.06	.10	-.03
25	-.04	-.55	.33	-.07	-.13	.11	.01

TABLE 41

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

	Factor						
Item	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1	-.08	-.01	.07	.58	.11	-.20	.01
2	-.13	.13	.19	.45	.21	-.23	.25
3	.08	.11	.05	-.52	-.25	-.19	.21
4	.07	.11	.03	.69	-.07	-.13	.06
5	.53	-.06	.10	-.09	.13	-.13	.19
6	-.03	.23	.13	-.07	.11	.58	.01
7	-.65	-.09	.00	-.12	-.08	.05	-.04
8	.10	.00	.12	.28	.35	.04	-.26
9	.66	.13	.03	-.09	.01	-.05	-.20
10	-.09	-.02	-.05	-.64	.05	-.11	-.03
11	-.66	-.04	.05	-.13	-.02	-.21	-.16
12	.07	-.07	.77	.04	-.06	.13	.10
13	-.25	-.08	.06	-.04	-.49	-.16	-.21
14	-.08	.03	.15	-.02	.72	-.03	-.03
15	-.07	.02	.80	-.03	.04	-.03	-.03
16	-.02	.36	.02	.02	.19	-.31	.08
17	.04	.50	.02	-.04	-.05	.04	.18
18	.00	.88	-.05	.05	-.05	.06	-.18
19	.19	.26	.31	.04	.08	-.26	-.27
20	-.19	.01	-.28	-.14	-.27	-.06	.09
21	.07	.59	.03	.01	.08	.12	.08
22	-.02	-.15	.01	-.15	-.12	.01	-.38
23	-.03	.29	.13	.17	.12	-.02	-.25
24	.43	.01	.00	-.34	.08	-.15	-.21
25	-.66	.02	-.18	-.02	.24	-.07	.11

TABLE 42

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Item	Factor I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1	-.02	.16	.05	.73	.15	-.14	-.03
2	.09	-.03	.09	.78	.06	.09	-.12
3	.09	-.06	-.07	-.09	-.40	.00	-.06
4	.05	-.08	-.03	.06	.57	.07	.10
5	.63	.06	.16	.07	.05	.06	-.21
6	.10	.65	.00	.21	.02	-.18	.14
7	-.68	.05	.01	.02	-.04	.02	-.16
8	-.04	.28	.12	.24	.27	.09	-.10
9	.72	.04	.06	-.03	.08	.02	-.12
10	-.26	.18	.20	-.08	-.43	-.12	-.18
11	-.61	-.02	-.12	-.08	.20	-.11	-.03
12	.12	-.06	.70	-.04	.02	.10	.00
13	-.26	-.12	.08	.01	-.03	-.46	-.19
14	-.04	.07	.11	.02	.25	.66	-.11
15	.03	-.11	.70	.04	.01	-.01	.10
16	.14	.33	-.03	.15	.26	.09	-.10
17	.01	.42	-.03	-.17	.03	.05	-.06
18	.05	.72	.01	.05	-.14	.17	.22
19	.16	.12	.35	.03	-.11	.47	-.05
20	-.21	-.14	-.21	-.23	.18	-.32	-.27
21	.00	.65	-.03	.05	-.01	.28	.02
22	.05	-.11	-.09	.08	-.15	.01	-.53
23	-.01	.31	.19	.07	.34	.07	-.07
24	.17	.13	.22	-.42	-.03	-.16	-.07
25	-.45	-.18	-.12	.18	.00	.00	.19

TABLE 43

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Item	Factor I	II	III	IV	V
1	.04	-.02	-.09	.00	.85
2	.05	.03	.12	.03	.74
3	.00	-.04	-.04	.13	-.71
4	-.37	-.40	-.03	-.05	.39
5	.57	.03	.00	.26	.08
6	.03	-.14	.24	.14	.37
7	-.85	-.23	.07	-.01	-.07
8	-.08	.02	.05	.36	.53
9	.70	-.09	.07	.16	-.01
10	.41	-.01	.24	-.21	-.19
11	-.71	.03	.02	.05	-.08
12	-.02	.03	.03	.79	-.10
13	-.09	-.10	-.47	.07	-.32
14	.01	.08	.33	.23	.51
15	.08	-.11	-.01	.73	.07
16	-.09	.15	.43	.27	.29
17	-.01	-.06	.80	-.10	-.07
18	-.04	.02	.78	.12	.07
19	.31	.01	.35	.40	-.04
20	-.03	-.23	-.17	-.40	-.28
21	-.11	.03	.74	.09	.04
22	.06	-.28	-.11	-.11	-.39
23	-.04	.15	.15	.43	.43
24	.38	-.44	.08	.28	-.18
25	-.63	.11	.12	.08	.02

TABLE 44

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

Item	Factor I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1	-.01	.00	-.13	.13	.16	.14	.69
2	.03	-.06	.10	.00	.05	.02	.78
3	.02	.06	-.05	-.10	.04	.14	-.60
4	-.42	.32	-.04	-.03	.14	-.19	.40
5	.63	.14	-.04	.07	.06	.00	.04
6	-.12	-.01	.29	.29	-.09	.19	.32
7	-.60	.10	-.15	.16	.00	-.18	.08
8	.03	-.08	-.10	.09	.58	.01	.13
9	.65	.15	.08	.02	.03	.19	-.11
10	.75	-.04	-.07	.07	-.10	-.11	-.04
11	-.76	-.07	-.01	.08	-.11	-.03	-.05
12	.00	-.01	.02	-.03	.00	.88	-.03
13	-.12	.17	-.31	-.15	.08	-.11	-.18
14	.12	-.11	.02	.62	.12	.04	.14
15	-.03	.03	-.14	.09	.08	.81	.02
16	-.04	.06	.03	.66	.08	.02	.08
17	-.02	.01	.69	-.10	-.07	-.05	.08
18	.01	.00	.64	.28	.23	-.09	-.16
19	.39	.15	.20	-.21	.19	.27	.06
20	-.14	-.02	-.06	-.11	-.52	-.19	.02
21	-.01	.06	.55	.24	.30	.02	-.08
22	.06	.33	.02	.03	-.31	.00	-.20
23	-.17	-.04	.16	.24	.38	.19	.03
24	.23	.45	.09	-.12	-.05	.32	-.16
25	-.33	-.48	.04	.02	.10	-.07	.02

TABLE 45

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

	Factor					
Item	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1	.05	.07	.07	.72	.01	-.11
2	.07	.06	.03	.73	.16	.13
3	.23	-.07	-.04	-.39	-.30	-.16
4	.13	-.05	.05	.26	.60	-.04
5	.70	.07	.03	.14	.12	-.12
6	-.04	.47	.17	.06	-.12	.02
7	-.71	-.04	-.01	.14	-.27	-.05
8	.03	.17	.65	.07	-.05	-.11
9	.68	.03	.07	.02	-.06	-.10
10	.06	-.05	-.06	.00	-.67	-.05
11	-.47	-.31	.01	.21	-.12	-.30
12	.10	-.04	.74	-.03	.06	.23
13	.11	-.57	-.04	.00	-.05	-.18
14	.03	.30	.37	.28	.06	-.01
15	.14	-.12	.78	.04	.11	.00
16	-.06	.44	.28	.10	.26	-.12
17	.14	.58	-.20	.15	-.01	.02
18	-.01	.74	.18	-.08	.26	-.16
19	.26	.18	.33	.01	.03	.44
20	-.05	-.13	-.42	-.17	-.13	-.16
21	.14	.54	.20	.17	.07	.08
22	.26	-.09	-.20	-.28	-.11	-.32
23	-.08	.27	.47	.27	.04	-.12
24	.54	-.02	-.02	.03	-.22	.23
25	-.63	.14	-.16	-.01	.14	-.08

TABLE 46

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT HOME AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

	Factor							
Item	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
1	.11	-.16	.00	.09	.08	-.04	.74	-.04
2	.13	-.10	.00	.15	.07	.26	.66	.26
3	.10	.11	-.04	-.30	-.06	-.23	-.34	-.23
4	.06	-.18	.04	-.06	.01	.49	.30	.49
5	.58	.21	-.02	-.01	.02	.15	.16	.15
6	-.15	.19	.27	-.03	.04	.10	.49	.10
7	-.51	-.28	.04	-.28	-.03	-.16	.01	-.16
8	-.11	.03	-.08	.07	.07	.06	.23	.06
9	.12	.63	-.01	-.06	.06	.01	-.05	.01
10	-.09	.04	.03	-.04	-.05	-.65	-.09	-.65
11	-.51	-.08	-.03	.06	-.19	-.20	.24	-.20
12	.08	-.02	.10	.10	.80	-.11	.02	-.11
13	.15	-.23	-.22	-.31	.05	-.36	.03	-.36
14	.01	-.10	.17	.31	.18	.42	.03	.42
15	-.08	.01	-.06	-.06	.84	.02	.00	.02
16	.05	-.22	.16	.31	.11	.20	.09	.20
17	-.01	.08	.75	.11	-.01	-.11	.01	-.11
18	.05	-.19	.78	-.06	.00	.11	-.05	.11
19	.16	.26	.19	-.11	.21	.12	-.03	.12
20	-.15	.03	-.04	-.10	-.03	.03	.06	.03
21	.07	-.01	.74	-.05	.08	.03	.10	.03
22	.00	.07	-.04	-.49	.00	-.01	-.04	-.01
23	.05	-.01	.04	.43	.12	-.14	.17	-.14
24	.17	.49	-.01	-.07	-.01	-.18	-.03	-.18
25	-.64	-.01	-.07	.03	.01	.09	-.03	.09

TABLE 47

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

	Factor					
Item	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1	-.08	-.05	.06	.74	-.13	-.05
2	.00	.26	.05	.51	.06	-.04
3	-.15	-.02	.07	-.65	-.19	-.07
4	-.43	.01	-.11	-.05	-.10	.36
5	.58	.01	.07	.00	-.17	.09
6	-.23	.13	.25	.23	.24	-.25
7	-.71	.02	-.03	.12	-.17	.01
8	.12	.33	.21	.15	.16	.38
9	.62	.06	.14	-.12	-.22	-.09
10	.51	.02	.16	-.27	.04	-.14
11	-.69	-.07	.06	-.02	-.17	.06
12	.05	.09	.57	-.05	.19	-.08
13	-.06	-.59	.03	.08	-.22	-.12
14	-.01	.74	.20	.02	.05	.22
15	.01	-.07	.79	.06	-.07	.09
16	-.05	.85	.09	.06	-.13	.12
17	-.09	.60	-.02	-.02	-.18	-.38
18	.10	.74	-.03	.08	.00	-.15
19	.14	.37	.28	.02	-.17	-.34
20	-.29	-.22	-.21	-.06	-.34	.06
21	.04	.68	-.09	.09	.12	-.16
22	.00	-.05	-.05	-.08	-.52	-.02
23	-.03	.47	.14	.27	.05	.08
24	.41	.07	.29	.02	-.38	-.06
25	-.70	.03	.06	-.17	.04	-.15

TABLE 48

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT WOMEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

	Factor					
Item	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1	-.16	-.06	-.20	.15	.78	.10
2	-.13	-.17	.05	.12	.61	.04
3	-.05	-.06	-.07	.12	-.78	.06
4	-.36	-.20	-.09	-.13	.14	-.02
5	.37	.02	-.04	.07	.00	.57
6	-.18	.02	.55	.07	.17	.25
7	-.64	.04	.14	-.18	.08	-.17
8	-.02	.02	.21	.12	.28	.46
9	.45	.18	-.06	.12	-.11	.37
10	.46	.32	-.11	-.07	.00	.12
11	-.71	-.01	-.05	-.06	.06	.02
12	-.02	.04	.02	.78	-.01	-.03
13	-.16	.22	-.53	-.16	-.14	.22
14	.10	.00	.46	-.01	.39	.05
15	-.03	.01	-.09	.79	.05	.05
16	.08	-.34	.42	.07	.05	.29
17	-.06	.02	.70	.05	.04	-.22
18	-.05	.10	.88	-.03	.03	.08
19	.10	.14	.39	.35	-.17	.07
20	-.24	.01	-.15	-.38	-.15	.03
21	.05	-.09	.74	.02	-.01	.09
22	-.26	.27	-.15	.04	-.22	.03
23	.05	.03	.23	.05	.57	.02
24	.10	.65	.11	.12	-.03	.03
25	-.30	-.41	-.01	-.16	-.03	.01

TABLE 49

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT MEN AT WORK AS RESPONDED TO BY FEMALE SUBJECTS

Item	Factor					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1	-.01	-.07	-.15	.84	-.04	.12
2	-.04	.13	-.09	.76	.12	.00
3	.06	-.02	-.09	-.27	-.38	-.42
4	-.02	.04	.10	.63	.09	-.12
5	.68	-.16	.03	.13	-.01	-.13
6	-.08	.22	.27	.17	-.29	.33
7	-.68	.05	-.03	.05	-.31	.02
8	.14	.03	.16	.43	-.17	.02
9	.78	.09	-.01	.00	-.25	.06
10	-.01	.04	-.25	-.13	-.11	.30
11	-.67	-.16	.03	.06	-.24	-.08
12	-.01	.07	.75	-.06	.01	.06
13	-.01	-.25	.05	-.03	-.65	-.03
14	-.22	.26	.17	.32	.19	-.23
15	.07	-.06	.75	-.04	-.04	.03
16	-.07	.40	.05	.29	.07	-.25
17	.03	.63	-.06	.01	.02	.04
18	-.06	.67	-.03	.21	.08	.01
19	.31	.51	.16	-.01	-.02	-.09
20	-.28	-.15	-.13	-.02	-.49	-.12
21	-.17	.59	.10	.04	.12	.05
22	.07	.04	-.14	-.10	-.13	-.46
23	-.01	.16	.09	.54	-.02	.04
24	.55	.11	.04	-.10	-.19	-.13
25	-.64	.15	-.05	-.03	-.09	-.01

TABLE 50

FACTOR PATTERN LOADINGS FROM OBLIQUE ROTATION USING PRIMARY AXES FOR SECTION OF INSTRUMENT *MEN AT WORK* AS RESPONDED TO BY MALE SUBJECTS

	Factor						
Item	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
1	.02	.08	-.02	.75	.11	-.08	-.10
2	.01	.04	.05	.87	.01	-.04	.05
3	.16	.07	.05	-.46	-.19	-.24	-.04
4	.04	.03	.02	.67	.00	.09	.05
5	.44	.10	.45	.02	-.12	-.03	-.05
6	-.22	.10	.04	.22	.08	-.11	.40
7	-.47	.31	-.15	.13	-.25	-.04	-.19
8	.15	-.02	.07	.28	.49	-.05	.00
9	.48	.06	.22	-.14	.10	-.31	.08
10	-.19	.07	.07	-.18	-.01	-.35	-.18
11	-.48	-.04	-.14	.14	.09	-.29	-.18
12	-.15	-.02	.85	-.01	.01	-.02	.17
13	-.06	-.45	-.02	.01	-.07	-.60	-.01
14	.03	.40	.10	.13	.28	.18	-.06
15	.02	-.06	.78	.04	.03	.04	-.12
16	.00	.16	-.01	.09	.69	-.06	.04
17	.14	.63	-.09	.12	-.01	-.06	.05
18	-.12	.65	.07	.02	.26	.08	.10
19	.18	.20	.17	.04	-.12	-.15	.56
20	-.16	-.04	-.04	.08	-.19	-.23	-.53
21	-.16	.52	.09	.09	.13	.00	.24
22	.14	.02	.07	-.05	-.08	-.14	-.34
23	-.24	.27	.05	.15	.33	.04	.05
24	.43	.07	-.02	-.09	.02	-.56	.00
25	-.65	.00	-.02	.03	.00	-.05	.05

APPENDIX D

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ITEMS ON THE FINAL INSTRUMENT

TABLE 51

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ITEMS ON EACH SECTION OF THE INSTRUMENT BROKEN DOWN BY SEX BY YEAR IN COLLEGE, COLLEGE, AND RACE

Aggressive-Unaggressive

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women	Overall	4.42	1.26	3.65	1.32
	Freshman	4.26	1.29	3.64	1.54
	Sophomore	4.27	1.26	3.41	1.35
	Junior	4.54	1.35	3.75	1.13
	Senior	4.23	1.10	3.66	1.16
	University College	4.43	1.31	3.58	1.49
	Engineering	4.33	1.20	2.83	1.17
	Arts and Sciences	4.44	1.29	3.85	1.26
	Business Administration	4.13	1.18	4.00	1.08
	Journalism	4.95	1.00	3.80	1.28
	Education	3.00	0.0	3.41	0.91
	Other	4.44	1.42	3.67	0.82
	Caucasian	4.38	1.22	3.68	1.26
	Black	5.20	1.40	3.42	1.65
	Other	4.45	1.63	3.00	1.41
Men	Overall	2.13	0.86	2.09	0.88
	Freshman	1.98	0.82	2.00	0.93
	Sophomore	2.07	0.80	1.94	0.98
	Junior	2.18	0.87	2.20	0.86
	Senior	2.23	0.90	2.16	0.78
	University College	2.06	0.83	1.97	0.95
	Engineering	2.24	0.82	2.00	0.89
	Arts and Sciences	2.29	1.08	2.30	0.91
	Business Administration	1.93	0.63	2.17	0.62
	Journalism	2.35	0.81	2.17	0.71
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.14	0.92
	Other	2.00	0.87	2.50	0.84
	Caucasian	2.16	0.86	2.12	0.84
	Black	1.70	0.82	1.91	1.07
	Other	2.00	0.89	2.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Aggressive-Unaggressive - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Home	Overall	4.43	1.63	4.32	1.79
	Freshman	4.11	1.71	3.95	1.98
	Sophomore	4.58	1.75	4.00	1.72
	Junior	4.70	1.60	4.82	1.51
	Senior	4.32	1.53	4.54	1.62
	University College	4.33	1.75	4.00	1.93
	Engineering	4.45	1.53	5.67	1.75
	Arts and Sciences	4.69	1.69	4.81	1.47
	Business Administration	4.48	1.46	4.67	1.37
	Journalism	4.10	1.65	4.72	1.62
	Education	5.00	0.0	4.03	1.55
	Other	4.78	1.09	5.17	1.17
	Caucasian	4.40	1.61	4.43	1.68
	Black	5.30	1.70	3.82	2.23
	Other	4.36	1.96	3.00	0.0
Men At Home	Overall	3.41	1.64	3.83	1.88
	Freshman	3.04	1.86	3.76	2.03
	Sophomore	3.74	1.76	3.53	1.85
	Junior	3.45	1.50	3.77	1.91
	Senior	3.45	1.54	4.07	1.71
	University College	3.41	1.82	3.68	1.93
	Engineering	3.26	1.58	3.67	2.42
	Arts and Sciences	3.60	1.48	3.52	1.81
	Business Administration	3.16	1.37	3.55	1.76
	Journalism	3.75	1.77	4.55	1.77
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.65	1.80
	Other	3.44	1.42	3.83	1.72
	Caucasian	3.42	1.64	3.91	1.84
	Black	3.40	2.01	3.48	2.11
	Other	3.18	1.47	2.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Aggressive-Unaggressive - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	2.51	1.16	2.14	1.07
	Freshman	2.64	1.23	2.18	1.40
	Sophomore	2.88	1.43	1.88	0.98
	Junior	2.26	0.91	2.18	0.99
	Senior	2.43	1.13	2.18	0.67
	University College	2.72	1.29	2.08	1.27
	Engineering	2.29	1.29	1.67	0.82
	Arts and Sciences	2.56	1.08	2.26	0.90
	Business Administration	2.19	0.79	2.39	0.61
	Journalism	2.40	0.88	2.22	1.02
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.17	0.71
	Other	2.11	0.78	1.83	0.41
	Caucasian	2.48	1.14	2.11	0.92
	Black	2.50	0.97	2.39	1.75
	Other	3.00	1.67	1.50	0.71
Men At Work	Overall	1.98	1.02	1.76	0.94
	Freshman	1.79	0.84	1.68	0.98
	Sophomore	1.86	1.06	1.79	1.20
	Junior	1.95	0.94	1.73	0.84
	Senior	2.21	1.15	1.84	0.83
	University College	1.88	0.97	1.65	0.95
	Engineering	2.12	0.92	2.33	1.86
	Arts and Sciences	2.00	1.26	1.89	0.89
	Business Administration	1.97	1.05	1.67	0.77
	Journalism	2.25	1.02	1.85	0.89
	Education	2.00	0.0	1.86	0.95
	Other	1.78	0.67	1.83	0.75
	Caucasian	2.00	1.03	1.74	0.84
	Black	1.70	0.82	1.91	1.42
	Other	1.91	0.94	1.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Strong-Weak

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	4.44	1.26	3.28	1.35
	Freshman	4.98	1.13	3.26	1.39
	Sophomore	4.51	1.20	2.76	1.23
	Junior	4.30	1.32	3.50	1.38
	Senior	4.17	1.23	3.34	1.29
	University College	4.66	1.32	3.14	1.41
	Engineering	4.36	1.16	3.83	1.17
	Arts and Sciences	4.38	1.25	3.41	1.19
	Business Administration	4.10	1.07	3.55	1.10
	Journalism	4.20	1.36	3.10	1.46
	Education	5.00	0.0	3.45	1.35
	Other	4.33	1.41	3.50	1.05
	Caucasian	4.42	1.25	3.24	1.31
	Black	5.40	0.97	3.45	1.62
	Other	4.00	1.41	3.50	0.71
Men	Overall	2.22	0.85	2.19	1.08
	Freshman	2.02	0.75	2.04	1.10
	Sophomore	2.42	0.91	2.03	1.17
	Junior	2.24	0.85	2.34	1.21
	Senior	2.23	0.86	2.30	0.90
	University College	2.23	0.85	2.11	1.20
	Engineering	2.12	0.80	1.83	1.17
	Arts and Sciences	2.33	0.88	2.33	0.83
	Business Administration	2.13	0.88	2.00	0.69
	Journalism	2.35	0.81	2.37	1.10
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.21	1.01
	Other	2.00	1.00	2.17	0.75
	Caucasian	2.23	0.84	2.25	1.07
	Black	2.00	0.94	1.79	1.14
	Other	2.18	0.87	1.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Strong-Weak - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	4.01	1.52	3.72	1.69
	Freshman	4.04	1.48	3.73	1.85
	Sophomore	3.86	1.64	3.18	1.49
	Junior	4.26	1.56	4.14	1.68
	Senior	3.82	1.42	3.69	1.50
	University College	3.93	1.58	3.59	1.77
	Engineering	4.02	1.46	4.83	1.17
	Arts and Sciences	4.07	1.51	4.22	1.55
	Business Administration	3.87	1.43	3.78	1.11
	Journalism	4.20	1.61	4.02	1.80
	Education	5.00	0.0	3.52	1.60
	Other	4.44	1.51	2.83	1.17
	Caucasian	4.01	1.50	3.72	1.63
	Black	3.90	1.97	3.91	2.04
	Other	4.00	1.67	3.00	0.0
Men At Home	Overall	2.94	1.45	3.14	1.73
	Freshman	2.73	1.78	2.95	1.88
	Sophomore	2.95	1.31	2.71	1.55
	Junior	3.05	1.37	3.46	1.81
	Senior	2.94	1.36	3.26	1.54
	University College	2.88	1.57	2.88	1.73
	Engineering	2.86	1.42	4.33	1.63
	Arts and Sciences	3.27	1.34	3.04	1.58
	Business Administration	2.74	1.34	3.17	1.47
	Journalism	3.00	1.49	3.87	1.94
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.83	1.51
	Other	2.78	1.09	2.33	0.82
	Caucasian	2.93	1.44	3.15	1.70
	Black	2.80	1.55	3.06	1.95
	Other	3.00	1.67	3.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Strong-Weak - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	2.85	1.15	2.21	1.03
	Freshman	3.21	1.36	2.08	1.04
	Sophomore	2.91	1.19	1.97	0.97
	Junior	2.71	1.09	2.29	0.98
	Senior	2.71	0.97	2.40	1.07
	University College	3.09	1.29	2.07	1.01
	Engineering	2.67	1.16	2.33	1.21
	Arts and Sciences	2.55	0.89	2.33	0.78
	Business Administration	2.61	0.80	2.72	1.32
	Journalism	2.90	0.91	2.22	1.14
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.34	1.01
	Other	3.22	1.56	2.33	0.52
	Caucasian	2.87	1.17	2.20	0.95
	Black	2.70	0.95	2.30	1.49
	Other	2.55	0.93	2.00	1.41
Men At Work	Overall	1.97	0.89	1.83	0.96
	Freshman	1.72	0.69	1.76	1.05
	Sophomore	1.95	0.84	1.59	0.82
	Junior	2.06	1.00	1.89	0.98
	Senior	2.05	0.91	1.97	0.89
	University College	1.88	0.80	1.72	0.99
	Engineering	2.05	0.91	1.83	0.41
	Arts and Sciences	2.07	1.14	2.00	0.88
	Business Administration	1.84	0.64	1.83	0.92
	Journalism	2.30	1.08	2.07	1.12
	Education	2.00	0.0	1.76	0.83
	Other	1.78	0.67	1.83	0.41
	Caucasian	1.99	0.90	1.85	0.95
	Black	1.70	0.67	1.73	1.07
	Other	1.82	0.87	1.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Submissive-Dominating

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women	Overall	3.39	1.16	3.84	1.26
	Freshman	3.34	1.19	3.74	1.42
	Sophomore	3.32	1.11	4.09	1.31
	Junior	3.50	1.26	3.87	1.15
	Senior	3.36	1.08	3.82	1.15
	University College	3.32	1.12	3.84	1.40
	Engineering	3.38	1.06	3.83	2.04
	Arts and Sciences	3.51	1.31	3.89	1.09
	Business Administration	3.55	1.15	3.89	0.83
	Journalism	3.40	1.35	3.92	1.14
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.62	1.29
	Other	3.22	1.09	3.83	0.75
	Caucasian	3.45	1.15	3.80	1.23
	Black	2.70	1.16	4.03	1.51
	Other	2.73	1.01	4.50	0.71
Men	Overall	5.48	1.20	5.45	1.23
	Freshman	5.73	1.27	5.48	1.42
	Sophomore	5.42	1.30	5.68	1.04
	Junior	5.56	1.16	5.43	1.14
	Senior	5.24	1.13	5.34	1.16
	University College	5.63	1.24	5.54	1.32
	Engineering	5.21	1.22	5.17	2.32
	Arts and Sciences	5.29	1.31	5.33	1.04
	Business Administration	5.64	0.88	5.61	0.85
	Journalism	5.25	1.25	5.40	1.03
	Education	6.00	0.0	5.17	1.26
	Other	5.78	0.97	6.00	0.89
	Caucasian	5.44	1.22	5.50	1.12
	Black	6.10	0.74	5.24	1.62
	Other	5.64	1.03	3.00	2.83

Table 51 - Continued

Submissive-Dominating - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	3.47	1.51	3.62	1.67
	Freshman	3.94	1.67	3.61	1.89
	Sophomore	3.30	1.52	3.94	1.43
	Junior	3.16	1.53	3.23	1.55
	Sophomore	3.55	1.28	3.80	1.55
	University College	3.57	1.66	3.74	1.80
	Engineering	3.57	1.40	2.67	1.97
	Arts and Sciences	3.15	1.35	3.41	1.60
	Business Administration	3.35	1.28	3.61	1.50
	Journalism	3.30	1.52	3.60	1.58
	Education	3.00	0.0	3.62	1.54
	Other	4.33	1.66	3.50	1.38
	Caucasian	3.52	1.50	3.53	1.56
	Black	2.90	1.79	4.09	2.16
	Other	2.91	1.30	4.50	2.12
Men At Home	Overall	4.70	1.61	4.50	1.70
	Freshman	4.92	1.89	4.49	1.83
	Sophomore	4.58	1.78	5.18	1.49
	Junior	4.56	1.52	4.23	1.70
	Senior	4.72	1.38	4.47	1.58
	University College	4.75	1.80	4.55	1.77
	Engineering	5.00	1.31	4.33	1.63
	Arts and Sciences	4.40	1.42	4.74	1.63
	Business Administration	4.74	1.57	4.89	1.49
	Journalism	4.05	1.67	3.75	1.82
	Education	6.00	0.0	4.86	1.22
	Other	5.11	1.05	5.17	1.17
	Caucasian	4.66	1.57	4.50	1.67
	Black	5.10	2.08	4.70	1.85
	Other	4.91	2.02	5.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Submissive-Dominating - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Work	Overall	4.78	1.21	5.08	1.38
	Freshman	4.49	1.46	5.02	1.73
	Sophomore	4.65	1.29	5.21	1.30
	Junior	4.97	1.14	5.25	1.13
	Senior	4.88	1.02	4.96	1.13
	University College	4.54	1.38	5.12	1.59
	Engineering	4.86	1.18	4.33	2.06
	Arts and Sciences	5.02	1.12	5.18	0.62
	Business Administration	5.13	0.72	4.89	1.13
	Journalism	4.70	1.08	5.22	1.02
	Education	5.00	0.0	4.90	1.57
	Other	5.11	1.27	5.00	0.89
	Caucasian	4.79	1.23	5.19	1.23
	Black	4.60	1.07	4.30	1.96
	Other	4.82	0.98	5.50	0.71
Men At Work	Overall	5.60	1.30	5.76	1.47
	Freshman	5.89	1.09	5.52	1.83
	Sophomore	5.86	1.24	6.09	1.26
	Junior	5.58	1.35	5.91	1.18
	Senior	5.29	1.38	5.77	1.27
	University College	5.86	1.13	5.71	1.65
	Engineering	5.43	1.17	6.50	0.55
	Arts and Sciences	5.29	1.66	5.81	1.30
	Business Administration	5.71	1.01	6.17	1.04
	Journalism	4.95	1.70	5.80	1.28
	Education	6.00	0.0	5.41	1.57
	Other	6.11	0.78	6.17	0.41
	Caucasian	5.56	1.33	5.92	1.24
	Black	6.30	0.82	4.73	2.28
	Other	5.91	0.94	6.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Masculine-Feminine

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women	Overall	6.01	1.09	5.87	1.08
	Freshman	6.13	1.00	5.79	1.20
	Sophomore	5.91	0.95	6.09	1.08
	Junior	5.97	1.34	5.75	1.01
	Senior	6.00	0.97	5.96	0.97
	University College	6.08	0.92	5.85	1.19
	Engineering	5.98	0.95	5.50	1.05
	Arts and Sciences	5.73	1.42	5.85	0.91
	Business Administration	6.13	0.96	6.11	1.02
	Journalism	6.00	1.41	5.90	0.98
	Education	7.00	0.0	5.93	1.00
	Other	6.11	1.36	5.83	1.17
	Caucasian	6.00	1.10	5.85	1.06
	Black	6.10	0.74	6.09	1.18
	Other	6.00	1.18	4.50	0.71
Men	Overall	1.73	0.83	1.78	0.93
	Freshman	1.42	0.53	1.77	1.09
	Sophomore	1.88	1.03	1.65	0.88
	Junior	1.81	0.87	1.87	0.90
	Senior	1.78	0.80	1.76	0.77
	University College	1.65	0.84	1.78	1.05
	Engineering	1.90	0.98	1.33	0.52
	Arts and Sciences	1.89	0.88	1.89	0.89
	Business Administration	1.48	0.62	1.56	0.62
	Journalism	1.85	0.67	1.80	0.76
	Education	1.00	0.0	1.86	0.95
	Other	1.78	0.44	1.50	0.55
	Caucasian	1.73	0.83	1.75	0.81
	Black	1.90	0.99	1.97	1.48
	Other	1.64	0.81	1.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Masculine-Feminine - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	5.65	1.33	5.89	1.17
	Freshman	5.57	1.32	5.96	1.26
	Sophomore	5.53	1.56	5.91	1.11
	Junior	5.58	1.44	5.93	1.17
	Senior	5.83	1.07	5.74	1.09
	University College	5.53	1.49	5.89	1.24
	Engineering	5.88	0.94	6.33	1.21
	Arts and Sciences	5.62	1.39	5.92	1.14
	Business Administration	5.94	1.00	6.22	0.88
	Journalism	5.45	1.54	5.72	1.15
	Education	7.00	0.0	5.65	1.20
	Other	5.33	1.32	6.17	0.41
	Caucasian	5.62	1.33	5.83	1.15
	Black	6.20	0.92	6.24	1.25
	Other	5.82	1.60	5.00	1.41
Men At Home	Overall	2.35	1.34	2.20	1.28
	Freshman	2.17	1.44	2.04	1.37
	Sophomore	2.32	1.36	1.91	1.06
	Junior	2.61	1.44	2.41	1.44
	Senior	2.23	1.13	2.34	1.09
	University College	2.24	1.36	2.02	1.22
	Engineering	2.36	1.21	2.83	0.98
	Arts and Sciences	2.64	1.35	2.52	1.65
	Business Administration	2.26	1.41	2.11	1.18
	Journalism	2.25	1.41	2.45	1.36
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.28	1.19
	Other	2.78	1.39	2.00	0.63
	Caucasian	2.39	1.34	2.21	1.25
	Black	2.10	1.37	2.09	1.44
	Other	1.64	1.29	2.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Masculine-Feminine - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	4.60	1.55	5.18	1.39
	Freshman	4.77	1.58	4.98	1.55
	Sophomore	4.49	1.39	5.44	1.37
	Junior	4.76	1.70	5.50	1.22
	Senior	4.38	1.46	5.08	1.31
	University College	4.70	1.47	5.10	1.49
	Engineering	4.69	1.58	5.00	1.41
	Arts and Sciences	4.40	1.68	5.26	1.09
	Business Administration	4.52	1.48	5.28	1.23
	Journalism	4.55	1.61	5.32	1.47
	Education	3.00	0.0	5.17	1.34
	Other	4.67	1.94	5.83	1.60
	Caucasian	4.56	1.54	5.16	1.36
	Black	4.80	1.93	5.36	1.65
	Other	5.27	1.27	5.00	1.41
Men At Work	Overall	1.83	0.90	1.67	0.92
	Freshman	1.64	0.79	1.57	0.91
	Sophomore	1.93	1.01	1.46	0.82
	Junior	1.79	0.82	1.73	1.00
	Senior	1.94	0.98	1.81	0.92
	University College	1.78	0.87	1.55	0.89
	Engineering	1.93	0.95	1.33	0.52
	Arts and Sciences	1.89	0.93	1.89	0.93
	Business Administration	1.74	0.89	1.55	0.78
	Journalism	2.00	1.08	1.85	0.92
	Education	1.00	0.0	1.83	1.20
	Other	1.55	0.53	1.67	0.52
	Caucasian	1.85	0.91	1.70	0.93
	Black	1.90	0.99	1.48	0.90
	Other	1.36	0.50	1.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Affectionate-Nondemonstrative

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	2.35	1.23	2.00	0.95
	Freshman	2.38	1.21	1.90	0.94
	Sophomore	2.12	1.00	1.85	0.86
	Junior	2.34	1.22	2.02	0.98
	Senior	2.47	1.36	2.14	0.98
	University College	2.28	1.16	1.92	0.97
	Engineering	2.52	1.19	1.67	0.82
	Arts and Sciences	2.33	1.48	2.26	0.86
	Business Administration	2.03	0.55	2.11	0.83
	Journalism	2.75	1.45	1.90	0.78
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.17	1.23
	Other	2.78	1.79	1.67	0.82
	Caucasian	2.32	1.17	2.01	0.94
	Black	2.40	1.58	1.85	1.00
	Other	2.91	2.02	3.00	0.0
Men	Overall	3.55	1.41	2.95	1.26
	Freshman	3.51	1.55	3.30	1.56
	Sophomore	3.84	1.46	2.65	1.20
	Junior	3.55	1.43	2.75	0.96
	Senior	3.86	1.22	2.85	1.04
	University College	3.61	1.50	3.09	1.45
	Engineering	3.19	1.23	3.33	1.97
	Arts and Sciences	3.55	1.53	2.81	1.04
	Business Administration	3.74	1.24	2.55	1.20
	Journalism	3.80	1.15	2.87	0.99
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.76	0.95
	Other	3.33	1.12	2.67	0.52
	Caucasian	3.52	1.37	2.89	1.16
	Black	3.70	1.70	3.33	1.73
	Other	3.82	1.78	2.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Affectionate-Nondemonstrative - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Home	Overall	2.25	1.21	2.10	1.13
	Freshman	2.13	1.14	2.11	1.19
	Sophomore	2.14	1.10	1.82	0.90
	Junior	2.17	1.11	2.05	1.12
	Senior	2.46	1.36	2.26	1.15
	University College	2.13	1.13	2.03	1.10
	Engineering	2.26	1.25	2.50	1.38
	Arts and Sciences	2.49	1.32	2.07	0.83
	Business Administration	2.16	1.10	1.94	0.87
	Journalism	2.60	1.43	2.20	1.16
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.24	1.33
	Other	2.00	0.87	2.50	1.97
	Caucasian	2.26	1.18	2.05	1.05
	Black	2.30	1.64	2.45	1.54
	Other	1.91	1.22	2.50	0.71
Men At Home	Overall	3.05	1.29	2.79	1.31
	Freshman	2.68	1.12	2.77	1.46
	Sophomore	3.09	1.32	2.35	1.25
	Junior	3.22	1.31	2.87	1.24
	Senior	3.09	1.32	2.93	1.20
	University College	2.93	1.26	2.77	1.40
	Engineering	3.36	1.27	3.17	1.72
	Arts and Sciences	3.15	1.28	2.67	1.21
	Business Administration	2.64	1.23	2.72	1.13
	Journalism	3.30	1.45	2.85	1.37
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.83	1.20
	Other	3.22	1.39	2.83	0.75
	Caucasian	3.04	1.30	2.76	1.24
	Black	3.60	1.35	3.09	1.66
	Other	2.64	0.92	1.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Affectionate-Nondemonstrative - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	4.04	1.37	3.73	1.59
	Freshman	4.02	1.42	3.76	1.75
	Sophomore	4.09	1.41	3.71	1.73
	Junior	4.11	1.33	3.55	1.44
	Senior	3.95	1.36	3.82	1.47
	University College	4.09	1.38	3.81	1.70
	Engineering	3.83	1.50	4.17	2.64
	Arts and Sciences	4.29	1.34	3.59	1.39
	Business Administration	3.90	1.22	4.00	1.33
	Journalism	3.80	1.47	3.32	1.49
	Education	5.00	0.0	3.97	1.37
	Other	4.00	1.00	2.33	0.82
	Caucasian	4.03	1.38	3.82	1.52
	Black	3.70	1.34	2.94	1.82
	Other	4.55	0.93	6.00	0.0
Men At Work	Overall	4.55	1.46	4.36	1.69
	Freshman	4.09	1.58	3.98	1.86
	Sophomore	4.95	1.40	4.47	1.65
	Junior	4.53	1.31	4.54	1.59
	Senior	4.37	1.55	4.59	1.53
	University College	4.71	1.49	4.20	1.74
	Engineering	4.12	1.53	4.67	2.42
	Arts and Sciences	4.47	1.42	4.26	1.58
	Business Administration	4.71	1.27	4.72	1.49
	Journalism	4.40	1.43	4.42	1.66
	Education	3.00	0.0	4.48	1.70
	Other	5.00	1.66	4.83	1.72
	Caucasian	4.51	1.47	4.50	1.59
	Black	5.00	1.05	3.30	1.99
	Other	4.82	1.72	5.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Analytical-Nonanalytical

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	4.24	1.53	3.23	1.30
	Freshman	4.26	1.39	3.29	1.30
	Sophomore	4.19	1.73	3.09	1.31
	Junior	4.17	1.52	3.30	1.40
	Senior	4.28	1.53	3.16	1.25
	University College	4.19	1.49	3.24	1.33
	Engineering	4.67	1.43	3.83	1.94
	Arts and Sciences	4.11	1.61	3.48	1.34
	Business Administration	4.22	1.36	3.22	1.21
	Journalism	3.85	1.72	3.00	1.18
	Education	3.00	0.0	3.07	1.22
	Other	4.22	1.99	3.33	1.21
	Caucasian	4.24	1.48	3.22	1.31
	Black	4.00	2.36	3.36	1.29
	Other	4.09	1.64	3.00	0.0
Men	Overall	2.62	1.06	2.95	1.26
	Freshman	2.79	1.15	3.30	1.56
	Sophomore	2.63	1.15	2.65	1.20
	Junior	2.68	1.04	2.75	0.96
	Senior	2.46	0.95	2.85	1.04
	University College	2.73	1.13	3.09	1.45
	Engineering	2.40	1.13	3.33	1.97
	Arts and Sciences	2.53	0.97	2.81	1.04
	Business Administration	2.74	0.93	2.55	1.20
	Journalism	2.50	0.95	2.87	0.99
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.76	0.95
	Other	3.00	1.00	2.67	0.52
	Caucasian	2.62	1.07	2.89	1.16
	Black	2.70	0.95	3.33	1.73
	Other	2.64	1.03	2.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Analytical-Nonanalytical - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	4.07	1.54	3.72	1.51
	Freshman	4.08	1.69	3.56	1.67
	Sophomore	4.09	1.67	3.41	1.48
	Junior	4.20	1.46	4.09	1.50
	Senior	3.91	1.47	3.73	1.31
	University College	4.06	1.66	3.57	1.61
	Engineering	4.36	1.41	3.00	2.00
	Arts and Sciences	3.89	1.42	4.04	1.51
	Business Administration	3.90	1.62	3.72	1.18
	Journalism	4.00	1.72	4.15	1.35
	Education	5.00	0.0	3.48	1.24
	Other	4.22	0.83	3.50	1.52
	Caucasian	4.14	1.53	3.77	1.48
	Black	3.50	1.58	3.48	1.68
	Other	3.00	1.41	2.50	0.71
Men At Home	Overall	3.07	1.29	3.40	1.36
	Freshman	3.13	1.48	3.62	1.48
	Sophomore	2.95	1.09	2.91	1.31
	Junior	3.26	1.35	3.62	1.43
	Senior	2.91	1.17	3.20	1.11
	University College	4.64	1.23	5.03	1.52
	Engineering	4.67	1.20	4.33	1.51
	Arts and Sciences	4.71	1.36	4.85	1.32
	Business Administration	5.10	1.22	5.11	1.45
	Journalism	4.35	1.53	5.02	1.07
	Education	5.00	0.0	5.03	1.32
	Other	4.55	1.13	4.67	1.03
	Caucasian	4.73	1.25	5.14	1.26
	Black	4.20	1.62	4.09	1.77
	Other	4.27	1.27	4.50	2.12

Table 51- Continued

Analytical-Nonanalytical - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Work	Overall	2.70	1.08	2.51	1.19
	Freshman	2.87	1.21	2.71	1.38
	Sophomore	2.79	1.17	2.15	0.78
	Junior	2.63	1.08	2.39	1.23
	Senior	2.60	0.93	2.54	1.05
	University College	2.77	1.10	2.55	1.25
	Engineering	2.59	1.01	1.83	0.98
	Arts and Sciences	2.84	1.28	2.55	1.01
	Business Administration	2.32	0.83	2.00	0.77
	Journalism	2.75	0.97	2.70	1.32
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.59	1.21
	Other	2.89	1.05	2.67	0.82
	Caucasian	2.72	1.06	2.48	1.15
	Black	2.90	1.45	2.88	1.36
	Other	2.18	0.98	1.00	0.0
Men At Work	Overall	2.19	1.08	2.32	1.22
	Freshman	2.36	1.15	2.81	1.54
	Sophomore	2.12	1.09	1.85	0.86
	Junior	2.36	1.12	2.02	0.94
	Senior	1.96	0.94	2.20	0.95
	University College	2.25	1.11	2.52	1.44
	Engineering	1.86	0.90	1.67	0.82
	Arts and Sciences	2.35	1.15	2.15	0.82
	Business Administration	2.10	0.91	1.78	0.81
	Journalism	2.05	1.28	2.30	1.02
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.31	1.14
	Other	2.89	0.78	1.83	0.41
	Caucasian	2.18	1.06	2.31	1.20
	Black	2.80	1.32	2.48	1.37
	Other	1.82	0.98	1.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Cold-Warm

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	5.30	1.29	5.47	1.19
	Freshman	5.30	1.23	5.50	1.25
	Sophomore	5.47	1.16	5.74	0.96
	Junior	5.14	1.28	5.52	0.89
	Senior	5.36	1.40	5.28	1.40
	University College	5.33	1.17	5.51	1.19
	Engineering	5.33	1.49	5.67	1.21
	Arts and Sciences	5.00	1.54	5.55	0.93
	Business Administration	5.71	0.82	5.50	1.50
	Journalism	5.05	1.47	5.37	1.17
	Education	6.00	0.0	5.17	1.36
	Other	5.33	0.87	6.17	0.41
	Caucasian	5.32	1.25	5.53	1.09
	Black	5.20	1.32	5.09	1.66
	Other	4.91	1.97	4.50	0.71
Men	Overall	4.09	1.34	4.39	1.36
	Freshman	4.28	1.47	4.43	1.43
	Sophomore	3.81	1.35	4.85	1.40
	Junior	4.06	1.26	4.41	1.33
	Senior	4.13	1.34	4.19	1.15
	University College	4.05	1.41	4.47	1.43
	Engineering	4.36	1.19	3.83	1.47
	Arts and Sciences	3.91	1.33	4.37	1.18
	Business Administration	4.06	1.24	5.05	1.05
	Journalism	3.95	1.61	4.12	1.30
	Education	5.00	0.0	4.28	1.33
	Other	4.44	1.33	4.50	0.55
	Caucasian	4.10	1.35	4.48	1.27
	Black	3.60	1.26	3.88	1.56
	Other	4.18	1.40	5.00	2.83

Table 51 - Continued

Cold-Warm - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	5.59	1.12	5.78	1.20
	Freshman	5.51	1.22	5.65	1.41
	Sophomore	5.30	1.26	5.97	1.09
	Junior	5.59	1.07	5.84	1.14
	Senior	5.79	0.99	5.77	1.04
	University College	5.40	1.25	5.69	1.36
	Engineering	5.88	0.83	6.33	0.82
	Arts and Sciences	5.53	1.10	5.78	1.12
	Business Administration	5.90	0.91	6.00	0.77
	Journalism	5.50	1.05	5.75	1.08
	Education	6.00	0.0	5.79	1.08
	Other	5.67	1.41	6.00	1.09
	Caucasian	5.59	1.11	5.81	1.17
	Black	5.70	1.16	5.51	1.44
	Other	5.36	1.36	6.00	0.0
Men At Home	Overall	4.67	1.27	4.99	1.38
	Freshman	4.72	1.20	4.89	1.56
	Sophomore	4.53	1.30	5.56	1.35
	Junior	4.74	1.34	5.05	1.26
	Senior	4.71	1.25	4.80	1.22
	University College	4.64	1.23	5.03	1.52
	Engineering	4.67	1.20	4.33	1.51
	Arts and Sciences	4.71	1.36	4.85	1.32
	Business Administration	5.10	1.22	5.11	1.45
	Journalism	4.35	1.53	5.02	1.07
	Education	5.00	0.0	5.03	1.32
	Other	4.55	1.13	4.67	1.03
	Caucasian	4.73	1.25	5.14	1.26
	Black	4.20	1.62	4.09	1.77
	Other	4.27	1.27	4.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Cold-Warm - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	4.03	1.34	4.34	1.40
	Freshman	3.94	1.32	4.20	1.58
	Sophomore	4.05	1.31	4.41	1.23
	Junior	4.06	1.41	4.64	1.41
	Senior	4.05	1.32	4.22	1.25
	University College	3.94	1.30	4.30	1.44
	Engineering	4.12	1.45	4.17	2.23
	Arts and Sciences	3.87	1.38	4.37	1.22
	Business Administration	3.97	1.14	4.44	1.62
	Journalism	4.35	1.35	4.52	1.41
	Education	2.00	0.0	4.17	1.26
	Other	5.22	1.20	5.00	0.0
	Caucasian	4.07	1.35	4.34	1.33
	Black	4.30	1.25	4.42	1.77
	Other	3.00	0.77	2.00	1.41
Men At Work	Overall	3.37	1.31	3.67	1.45
	Freshman	3.38	1.35	3.65	1.65
	Sophomore	3.02	1.20	3.88	1.57
	Junior	3.46	1.31	3.70	1.41
	Senior	3.49	1.35	3.57	1.19
	University College	3.25	1.24	3.67	1.56
	Engineering	3.59	1.62	3.17	0.75
	Arts and Sciences	3.27	1.34	3.78	1.67
	Business Administration	3.35	1.05	3.78	1.11
	Journalism	3.65	1.39	3.45	1.36
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.83	1.36
	Other	3.89	1.05	4.00	0.63
	Caucasian	3.43	1.32	3.65	1.39
	Black	2.90	1.10	3.88	1.87
	Other	2.73	1.19	3.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Adventurous-Reticent

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	3.61	1.47	3.00	1.45
	Freshman	3.68	1.52	2.87	1.49
	Sophomore	3.91	1.51	2.50	1.46
	Junior	3.75	1.50	3.11	1.38
	Senior	3.27	1.36	3.26	1.41
	University College	3.72	1.53	2.84	1.46
	Engineering	3.48	1.45	3.50	1.87
	Arts and Sciences	3.58	1.48	3.18	1.66
	Business Administration	3.61	1.20	3.22	1.39
	Journalism	3.70	1.56	2.95	1.34
	Education	1.00	0.0	3.10	1.42
	Other	3.33	1.66	3.67	1.03
	Caucasian	3.55	1.46	2.99	1.45
	Black	4.80	1.40	3.00	1.52
	Other	3.82	1.40	3.00	0.0
Men	Overall	2.22	1.01	2.32	1.17
	Freshman	2.06	1.08	2.17	1.18
	Sophomore	2.25	0.98	2.24	1.21
	Junior	2.18	0.97	2.29	1.02
	Senior	2.33	1.03	2.50	1.20
	University College	2.17	1.00	2.19	1.17
	Engineering	2.33	1.05	2.83	1.17
	Arts and Sciences	2.33	1.17	2.63	1.08
	Business Administration	2.00	0.77	2.11	1.28
	Journalism	2.55	1.05	2.35	1.00
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.38	1.32
	Other	1.67	0.50	2.50	1.05
	Caucasian	2.19	0.97	2.28	1.11
	Black	2.50	1.50	2.45	1.42
	Other	2.55	1.29	2.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Adventurous-Reticent - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	4.26	1.56	4.34	1.71
	Freshman	3.75	1.67	4.34	1.96
	Sophomore	4.25	1.73	4.15	1.65
	Junior	4.46	1.50	4.39	1.68
	Senior	4.38	1.39	4.36	1.49
	University College	4.09	1.74	4.36	1.87
	Engineering	4.38	1.59	4.17	1.94
	Arts and Sciences	4.44	1.34	4.59	1.69
	Business Administration	4.26	1.34	4.22	1.52
	Journalism	4.30	1.56	4.47	1.65
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.38	1.51
	Other	4.67	1.00	4.50	0.84
	Caucasian	4.22	1.54	4.38	1.64
	Black	5.00	1.88	4.12	2.22
	Other	4.27	1.68	3.00	1.41
Men At Home	Overall	3.53	1.49	3.78	1.70
	Freshman	3.19	1.71	3.65	1.85
	Sophomore	3.65	1.66	3.82	1.73
	Junior	3.68	1.43	3.66	1.79
	Senior	3.52	1.29	3.99	1.47
	University College	3.43	1.70	3.70	1.77
	Engineering	3.36	1.34	3.67	2.25
	Arts and Sciences	3.69	1.26	4.15	1.77
	Business Administration	3.64	1.28	3.61	1.75
	Journalism	3.80	1.61	4.00	1.71
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.45	1.35
	Other	3.67	1.41	4.00	1.41
	Caucasian	3.52	1.51	3.81	1.64
	Black	3.60	1.65	3.67	2.17
	Other	3.55	1.04	3.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Adventurous-Reticent - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	3.04	1.29	2.46	1.29
	Freshman	3.09	1.35	2.34	1.44
	Sophomore	3.16	1.38	2.50	1.16
	Junior	2.88	1.16	2.29	1.17
	Senior	3.06	1.31	2.70	1.26
	University College	3.08	1.32	2.33	1.32
	Engineering	2.98	1.33	2.67	1.37
	Arts and Sciences	3.20	1.32	2.70	1.10
	Business Administration	2.81	1.22	2.44	1.10
	Journalism	2.90	1.02	2.65	1.48
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.52	1.33
	Other	3.22	1.20	2.50	0.55
	Caucasian	3.03	1.27	2.47	1.25
	Black	2.80	1.55	2.39	1.58
	Other	3.36	1.43	3.50	0.71
Men At Work	Overall	2.58	1.29	2.56	1.34
	Freshman	2.51	1.22	2.51	1.47
	Sophomore	2.56	1.39	2.76	1.33
	Junior	2.50	1.18	2.37	1.24
	Senior	2.72	1.41	2.66	1.29
	University College	2.51	1.26	2.57	1.40
	Engineering	2.57	1.25	3.17	1.83
	Arts and Sciences	2.73	1.47	2.70	1.17
	Business Administration	2.58	1.48	2.44	0.98
	Journalism	2.65	1.14	2.45	1.41
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.59	1.48
	Other	2.55	0.88	2.33	0.52
	Caucasian	2.57	1.28	2.56	1.28
	Black	2.20	1.23	2.48	1.73
	Other	3.18	1.78	3.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Gentle-Harsh

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women	Overall	2.32	1.02	2.37	1.04
	Freshman	2.02	0.80	2.20	1.00
	Sophomore	2.51	1.05	1.91	0.83
	Junior	2.30	1.03	2.53	1.16
	Senior	2.42	1.10	2.51	1.00
	University College	2.25	0.91	2.19	1.05
	Engineering	2.43	1.27	3.00	1.55
	Arts and Sciences	2.33	1.04	2.59	1.05
	Business Administration	2.39	0.99	2.55	0.98
	Journalism	2.20	0.89	2.35	1.00
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.24	0.87
	Other	2.55	1.33	2.67	0.82
	Caucasian	2.35	1.02	1.91	0.95
	Black	1.80	0.63	2.03	1.29
	Other	2.09	1.22	3.00	1.41
Men	Overall	3.83	1.18	3.50	1.28
	Freshman	3.92	1.25	3.52	1.33
	Sophomore	4.14	1.10	3.47	1.31
	Junior	3.75	1.33	3.45	1.23
	Senior	3.68	1.01	3.57	1.21
	University College	4.02	1.23	3.48	1.31
	Engineering	3.55	0.94	3.50	1.05
	Arts and Sciences	3.71	1.31	3.85	1.17
	Business Administration	3.74	1.12	3.11	1.32
	Journalism	4.30	1.08	3.77	1.39
	Education	3.00	0.0	3.17	0.97
	Other	3.00	0.87	3.67	1.03
	Caucasian	3.82	1.18	3.47	1.19
	Black	4.20	1.32	3.82	1.61
	Other	3.73	1.19	3.00	2.83

Table 51 - Continued

Gentle-Harsh - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	2.31	1.09	2.15	1.19
	Freshman	2.28	1.21	1.99	1.32
	Sophomore	2.37	1.05	1.97	0.90
	Junior	2.33	1.12	2.20	1.08
	Senior	2.29	1.07	2.39	1.23
	University College	2.29	1.14	2.02	1.23
	Engineering	2.36	1.03	1.67	0.52
	Arts and Sciences	2.40	1.21	2.15	0.95
	Business Administration	2.10	0.79	1.83	0.79
	Journalism	2.50	1.19	2.77	1.44
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.17	1.07
	Other	2.33	1.12	1.83	0.75
	Caucasian	2.34	1.10	2.17	1.15
	Black	1.90	1.10	2.06	1.50
	Other	2.18	0.87	1.50	0.71
Men At Home	Overall	3.31	1.29	3.07	1.33
	Freshman	3.40	1.40	3.11	1.50
	Sophomore	3.49	1.39	3.09	1.26
	Junior	3.24	1.34	2.84	1.20
	Senior	3.23	1.10	3.18	1.25
	University College	3.43	1.41	3.16	1.39
	Engineering	3.14	1.28	3.50	1.38
	Arts and Sciences	3.24	1.25	2.93	0.87
	Business Administration	2.84	1.00	2.94	1.11
	Journalism	3.80	1.06	2.90	1.45
	Education	4.00	0.0	2.93	1.49
	Other	3.55	1.13	2.83	0.75
	Caucasian	3.33	1.29	2.98	1.22
	Black	3.50	1.51	3.55	1.89
	Other	2.73	0.90	4.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Gentle-Harsh - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Work	Overall	3.72	1.23	3.48	1.34
	Freshman	3.81	1.30	3.43	1.51
	Sophomore	3.65	1.33	3.65	1.41
	Junior	3.87	1.16	3.37	1.26
	Senior	3.56	1.21	3.53	1.20
	University College	3.79	1.28	3.52	1.43
	Engineering	3.55	1.21	3.67	1.75
	Arts and Sciences	3.91	1.34	3.41	1.28
	Business Administration	3.42	0.99	3.33	0.97
	Journalism	3.70	1.26	3.32	1.19
	Education	4.00	0.0	3.38	1.35
	Other	3.89	0.93	3.50	1.22
	Caucasian	3.74	1.24	3.56	1.29
	Black	3.60	1.35	2.82	1.49
	Other	3.55	1.13	5.00	1.41
Men At Work	Overall	4.59	1.28	4.29	1.33
	Freshman	4.79	1.26	4.24	1.60
	Sophomore	5.02	1.20	4.38	1.10
	Junior	4.58	1.27	4.12	1.32
	Senior	4.21	1.26	4.43	1.11
	University College	4.89	1.23	4.31	1.44
	Engineering	4.09	1.21	4.17	1.33
	Arts and Sciences	4.38	1.39	4.18	1.27
	Business Administration	4.29	0.94	4.11	1.02
	Journalism	4.60	1.64	4.42	1.45
	Education	5.00	0.0	4.17	1.14
	Other	5.33	0.71	4.67	0.82
	Caucasian	4.58	1.29	4.41	1.25
	Black	5.10	1.45	3.61	1.73
	Other	4.27	0.90	4.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Motherly-Fatherly

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women	Overall	2.04	0.91	2.34	1.04
	Freshman	1.89	0.91	2.20	1.00
	Sophomore	1.98	0.83	1.91	0.83
	Junior	2.04	0.96	2.54	1.16
	Senior	2.18	0.89	2.51	1.00
	University College	1.94	0.86	2.19	1.05
	Engineering	2.14	0.87	3.00	1.55
	Arts and Sciences	2.00	1.00	2.59	1.05
	Business Administration	2.13	0.92	2.55	0.98
	Journalism	1.90	0.79	2.35	1.00
	Education	4.00	0.0	2.24	0.87
	Other	2.67	1.00	2.67	0.82
	Caucasian	2.04	0.90	2.34	1.00
	Black	1.90	0.74	2.33	1.27
	Other	2.18	1.25	2.00	0.0
Men	Overall	5.91	0.91	5.85	1.12
	Freshman	6.19	0.83	5.90	1.27
	Sophomore	5.95	0.87	5.94	1.18
	Junior	5.89	0.93	5.79	1.02
	Senior	5.70	0.91	5.80	1.01
	University College	6.08	0.84	5.86	1.23
	Engineering	5.81	0.94	5.50	1.05
	Arts and Sciences	5.64	0.98	5.63	1.18
	Business Administration	5.90	0.75	6.00	1.08
	Journalism	5.80	1.15	5.97	0.83
	Education	5.00	0.0	5.83	1.17
	Other	6.11	0.78	5.67	0.52
	Caucasian	5.92	0.90	5.83	1.05
	Black	5.80	1.14	5.94	1.50
	Other	5.64	0.92	5.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Motherly-Fatherly - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	1.65	0.86	1.48	0.81
	Freshman	1.62	1.02	1.34	0.75
	Sophomore	1.72	0.88	1.56	0.93
	Junior	1.66	0.92	1.57	0.89
	Senior	1.61	0.65	1.54	0.74
	University College	1.65	0.94	1.42	0.84
	Engineering	1.69	0.68	1.33	0.52
	Arts and Sciences	1.71	0.89	1.59	0.80
	Business Administration	1.48	0.68	1.44	0.70
	Journalism	1.75	1.02	1.67	0.94
	Education	1.00	0.0	1.48	0.69
	Other	1.56	0.73	1.17	0.41
	Caucasian	1.65	0.84	1.50	0.81
	Black	1.40	0.97	1.39	0.83
	Other	1.82	1.17	1.00	0.0
Men At Home	Overall	5.67	1.31	5.66	1.50
	Freshman	5.89	1.32	5.86	1.61
	Sophomore	5.72	1.31	5.47	1.67
	Junior	5.56	1.33	5.55	1.46
	Senior	5.61	1.29	5.61	1.32
	University College	5.84	1.29	5.76	1.57
	Engineering	5.50	1.42	4.67	1.03
	Arts and Sciences	5.42	1.25	5.37	1.69
	Business Administration	6.10	1.07	6.11	0.96
	Journalism	5.05	1.50	5.22	1.49
	Education	6.00	0.0	5.79	1.45
	Other	5.78	1.09	6.50	0.55
	Caucasian	5.65	1.32	5.63	1.50
	Black	5.80	1.40	5.91	1.53
	Other	6.00	1.00	4.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Motherly-Fatherly - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	3.62	1.00	3.32	1.07
	Freshman	3.73	1.16	3.42	1.19
	Sophomore	3.44	0.91	3.35	1.10
	Junior	3.62	0.95	3.14	1.09
	Senior	3.63	0.99	3.32	0.91
	University College	3.62	1.04	3.41	1.13
	Engineering	3.57	1.08	3.17	0.98
	Arts and Sciences	3.64	0.86	3.30	1.20
	Business Administration	3.61	0.95	3.50	1.04
	Journalism	3.75	1.02	3.17	1.06
	Education	4.00	0.0	3.17	0.85
	Other	3.33	1.22	2.67	0.52
	Caucasian	3.64	1.01	3.42	0.97
	Black	3.60	1.07	2.73	1.46
	Other	3.18	0.87	4.00	0.0
Men At Work	Overall	5.03	1.28	5.12	1.18
	Freshman	5.13	1.37	5.26	1.30
	Sophomore	4.77	1.13	5.18	1.22
	Junior	5.18	1.20	5.20	1.20
	Senior	4.99	1.21	4.85	1.00
	University College	5.00	1.27	5.19	1.23
	Engineering	5.05	1.15	5.17	0.98
	Arts and Sciences	4.80	1.27	4.93	1.21
	Business Administration	5.13	1.06	4.44	0.85
	Journalism	5.30	1.38	5.27	1.22
	Education	6.00	0.0	4.97	1.01
	Other	5.67	1.12	5.50	1.38
	Caucasian	5.03	1.22	5.03	1.13
	Black	5.30	1.64	5.67	1.36
	Other	5.00	1.09	4.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Unsympathetic-Sympathetic

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	5.62	1.12	5.68	1.13
	Freshman	5.81	0.90	5.68	1.25
	Sophomore	5.63	1.27	5.88	1.01
	Junior	5.49	1.31	5.77	0.91
	Senior	5.61	0.96	5.53	1.20
	University College	5.75	1.05	5.76	1.18
	Engineering	5.43	0.99	5.33	0.52
	Arts and Sciences	5.40	1.34	5.41	1.01
	Business Administration	5.81	0.75	5.33	1.45
	Journalism	5.30	1.52	5.67	1.07
	Education	7.00	0.0	5.83	1.10
	Other	6.11	1.05	6.00	0.0
	Caucasian	5.63	1.11	5.75	1.06
	Black	5.60	1.51	5.27	1.51
	Other	5.36	1.12	5.00	0.0
Men	Overall	4.44	1.32	4.47	1.36
	Freshman	4.66	1.40	4.36	1.56
	Sophomore	4.19	1.48	4.91	1.21
	Junior	4.29	1.20	4.46	1.43
	Senior	4.58	1.26	4.42	1.11
	University College	4.44	1.44	4.44	1.46
	Engineering	4.90	1.16	4.17	0.41
	Arts and Sciences	4.49	1.18	4.67	1.36
	Business Administration	4.13	0.99	5.05	1.00
	Journalism	3.70	1.49	4.25	1.39
	Education	7.00	0.0	4.69	1.20
	Other	4.44	0.73	3.83	1.17
	Caucasian	4.44	1.31	4.51	1.34
	Black	4.10	1.10	4.27	1.48
	Other	4.73	1.68	5.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Unsympathetic-Sympathetic - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	5.90	1.00	5.95	1.15
	Freshman	5.92	1.07	5.63	1.41
	Sophomore	5.77	1.23	6.15	0.99
	Junior	5.89	1.00	6.07	0.99
	Senior	5.97	0.80	6.12	0.93
	University College	5.83	1.15	5.75	1.33
	Engineering	6.00	0.73	6.67	0.52
	Arts and Sciences	5.87	0.92	6.18	0.83
	Business Administration	6.00	0.77	6.05	1.00
	Journalism	5.90	1.29	5.90	1.10
	Education	6.00	0.0	6.31	0.81
	Other	6.11	0.78	6.17	0.41
	Caucasian	5.91	0.97	5.98	1.08
	Black	5.90	1.66	5.67	1.57
	Other	5.73	0.90	6.00	0.0
Men At Home	Overall	4.89	1.21	5.07	1.28
	Freshman	4.94	1.29	4.94	1.48
	Sophomore	4.84	1.43	5.29	1.34
	Junior	4.80	1.24	4.93	1.28
	Senior	4.99	1.00	5.22	1.01
	University College	4.88	1.39	4.98	1.38
	Engineering	4.69	1.22	4.00	2.10
	Arts and Sciences	5.00	1.09	5.22	1.25
	Business Administration	5.19	0.79	5.50	0.98
	Journalism	4.80	1.20	5.20	0.94
	Education	5.00	0.0	5.07	1.28
	Other	4.67	1.00	5.50	0.55
	Caucasian	4.92	1.21	5.12	1.19
	Black	4.20	1.62	4.76	1.70
	Other	4.91	0.83	6.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Unsympathetic-Sympathetic - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	4.27	1.20	4.57	1.32
	Freshman	4.40	1.04	4.30	1.39
	Sophomore	4.00	1.29	4.74	1.21
	Junior	4.21	1.32	4.98	1.10
	Senior	4.41	1.12	4.51	1.37
	University College	4.18	1.19	4.43	1.33
	Engineering	4.40	1.23	4.17	1.94
	Arts and Sciences	4.31	1.28	4.74	1.06
	Business Administration	4.39	1.05	4.67	1.24
	Journalism	4.15	1.18	4.72	1.32
	Education	3.00	0.0	4.65	1.37
	Other	4.67	1.50	6.00	0.0
	Caucasian	4.28	1.22	4.59	1.23
	Black	4.30	1.16	4.51	1.66
	Other	4.27	0.90	3.00	2.83
Men At Work	Overall	3.78	1.35	3.90	1.45
	Freshman	3.57	1.50	3.80	1.53
	Sophomore	3.74	1.20	3.94	1.52
	Junior	3.87	1.25	3.98	1.46
	Senior	3.85	1.42	3.95	1.34
	University College	3.61	1.34	3.74	1.43
	Engineering	4.33	1.36	3.83	0.98
	Arts and Sciences	3.64	1.33	4.26	1.37
	Business Administration	3.32	1.22	4.55	1.34
	Journalism	4.40	1.31	3.85	1.67
	Education	3.00	0.0	3.79	1.37
	Other	4.00	1.12	4.17	0.98
	Caucasian	3.76	1.33	3.89	1.42
	Black	3.70	1.70	4.00	1.68
	Other	4.27	1.42	4.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Attractive-Unattractive

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	2.17	1.18	2.66	1.15
	Freshman	2.26	1.17	2.69	1.28
	Sophomore	2.16	1.15	2.41	1.23
	Junior	2.12	1.12	2.71	1.07
	Senior	2.14	1.28	2.69	1.03
	University College	2.28	1.24	2.67	1.31
	Engineering	2.31	1.42	2.50	1.05
	Arts and Sciences	2.07	0.96	2.70	0.82
	Business Administration	2.03	1.14	2.89	0.90
	Journalism	1.85	0.93	2.35	1.07
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.83	0.97
	Other	2.00	1.12	3.33	0.82
	Caucasian	2.17	1.20	2.69	1.12
	Black	2.30	1.25	2.45	1.37
	Other	2.00	1.00	3.00	0.0
Men	Overall	3.57	1.28	2.56	1.13
	Freshman	3.60	1.62	2.70	1.24
	Sophomore	3.77	1.41	2.21	1.04
	Junior	3.59	0.97	2.37	1.12
	Senior	3.38	1.14	2.65	1.00
	University College	3.61	1.44	2.58	1.18
	Engineering	3.48	1.37	2.50	1.05
	Arts and Sciences	3.55	1.16	2.55	0.97
	Business Administration	3.39	1.02	2.61	1.04
	Journalism	3.75	0.79	2.37	1.15
	Education	3.00	0.0	2.59	1.12
	Other	3.67	0.71	2.83	1.17
	Caucasian	3.60	1.25	2.52	1.10
	Black	3.50	0.85	2.79	1.27
	Other	2.73	1.62	2.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Attractive-Unattractive - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Home	Overall	2.78	1.36	3.38	1.52
	Freshman	3.08	1.55	3.61	1.58
	Sophomore	2.72	1.33	3.18	1.55
	Junior	2.84	1.33	3.29	1.51
	Senior	2.55	1.26	3.27	1.46
	University College	2.87	1.47	3.49	1.62
	Engineering	2.40	1.13	3.67	1.37
	Arts and Sciences	2.78	1.20	3.22	1.22
	Business Administration	2.90	1.35	2.89	1.49
	Journalism	2.90	1.41	3.55	1.78
	Education	1.00	0.0	3.00	1.07
	Other	3.00	1.80	3.17	1.17
	Caucasian	2.77	1.35	3.39	1.49
	Black	2.60	1.35	3.36	1.78
	Other	3.09	1.70	3.00	1.41
Men At Home	Overall	3.67	1.24	3.34	1.53
	Freshman	3.60	1.55	3.36	1.60
	Sophomore	3.93	1.37	2.71	1.47
	Junior	3.66	1.06	3.59	1.63
	Senior	3.59	1.09	3.40	1.36
	University College	3.72	1.40	3.23	1.57
	Engineering	3.83	1.45	3.83	0.98
	Arts and Sciences	3.62	0.91	3.07	1.57
	Business Administration	3.52	1.18	3.44	1.65
	Journalism	3.50	0.83	3.80	1.57
	Education	3.00	0.0	3.14	1.25
	Other	3.67	0.71	3.00	1.26
	Caucasian	3.68	1.21	3.32	1.48
	Black	4.10	1.73	3.52	1.87
	Other	3.18	1.40	3.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Attractive-Unattractive - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Work	Overall	2.61	1.24	2.27	1.19
	Freshman	2.58	1.29	2.33	1.25
	Sophomore	2.30	0.91	2.06	1.10
	Junior	2.76	1.45	2.16	1.07
	Senior	2.63	1.13	2.35	1.23
	University College	2.57	1.22	2.23	1.19
	Engineering	2.59	1.17	2.17	1.47
	Arts and Sciences	3.00	1.54	2.52	1.12
	Business Administration	2.48	1.03	2.67	1.45
	Journalism	2.45	0.94	2.05	1.10
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.21	1.05
	Other	1.89	1.17	2.67	1.51
	Caucasian	2.60	1.24	2.28	1.13
	Black	3.00	1.41	2.12	1.52
	Other	2.36	1.03	3.50	0.71
Men At Work	Overall	3.76	1.27	2.64	1.26
	Freshman	3.92	1.52	2.71	1.38
	Sophomore	3.98	1.32	2.24	1.05
	Junior	3.78	1.05	2.54	1.33
	Senior	3.47	1.17	2.81	1.14
	University College	3.88	1.31	2.70	1.34
	Engineering	3.59	1.41	2.67	1.21
	Arts and Sciences	3.62	1.23	2.48	1.12
	Business Administration	3.61	1.23	2.61	1.14
	Journalism	3.95	0.82	2.57	1.17
	Education	4.00	0.0	2.65	1.37
	Other	3.55	0.73	2.83	1.33
	Caucasian	3.79	1.24	2.63	1.22
	Black	3.50	1.27	2.64	1.47
	Other	3.09	1.38	2.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Childlike-Mature

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women	Overall	4.19	1.53	4.78	1.47
	Freshman	4.25	1.43	4.99	1.62
	Sophomore	4.42	1.64	5.03	1.49
	Junior	4.00	1.63	4.68	1.50
	Senior	4.21	1.44	4.53	1.25
	University College	4.32	1.50	4.92	1.53
	Engineering	4.12	1.38	4.67	2.06
	Arts and Sciences	4.15	1.65	4.37	1.36
	Business Administration	4.16	1.51	5.00	1.24
	Journalism	4.00	1.72	4.70	1.47
	Education	2.00	0.0	4.59	1.43
	Other	3.89	1.76	4.83	1.17
	Caucasian	4.19	1.50	4.70	1.43
	Black	3.90	1.79	5.21	1.73
	Other	4.45	2.02	6.00	1.41
Men	Overall	4.75	1.32	4.34	1.61
	Freshman	4.98	1.13	4.24	1.79
	Sophomore	4.72	1.53	4.71	1.64
	Junior	4.73	1.39	4.41	1.65
	Senior	4.63	1.27	4.23	1.33
	University College	4.85	1.35	4.24	1.77
	Engineering	4.93	1.11	4.33	1.97
	Arts and Sciences	4.67	1.46	4.74	1.35
	Business Administration	4.74	1.39	4.78	1.80
	Journalism	4.25	1.16	3.95	1.39
	Education	2.00	0.0	4.55	1.27
	Other	4.55	1.13	4.50	1.05
	Caucasian	4.74	1.32	4.30	1.57
	Black	4.70	1.25	4.64	1.80
	Other	4.91	1.64	4.50	3.54

Table 51 - Continued

Childlike-Mature - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	4.85	1.48	5.06	1.56
	Freshman	5.02	1.50	5.30	1.58
	Sophomore	5.00	1.44	5.44	1.46
	Junior	4.80	1.55	4.52	1.75
	Senior	4.68	1.42	5.04	1.36
	University College	4.94	1.51	5.26	1.56
	Engineering	4.83	1.38	5.33	1.51
	Arts and Sciences	4.80	1.53	4.44	1.97
	Business Administration	4.87	1.43	5.22	1.17
	Journalism	4.45	1.67	4.75	1.53
	Education	2.00	0.0	5.14	1.30
	Other	5.11	0.78	5.17	1.72
	Caucasian	4.82	1.45	5.00	1.57
	Black	4.80	1.81	5.33	1.55
	Other	5.45	1.75	6.00	0.0
Men At Home	Overall	4.90	1.48	4.43	1.73
	Freshman	5.04	1.45	4.52	1.79
	Sophomore	4.98	1.63	4.65	1.67
	Junior	4.71	1.49	4.07	1.81
	Senior	4.95	1.40	4.50	1.62
	University College	4.93	1.52	4.51	1.68
	Engineering	4.98	1.40	3.17	1.60
	Arts and Sciences	4.87	1.56	4.74	1.85
	Business Administration	5.22	1.41	4.94	1.70
	Journalism	4.40	1.39	3.72	1.74
	Education	2.00	0.0	4.65	1.59
	Other	4.67	1.00	4.83	1.47
	Caucasian	4.89	1.44	4.38	1.69
	Black	4.90	1.91	4.70	1.94
	Other	5.09	2.03	6.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Childlike-Mature - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	5.37	1.22	5.92	1.21
	Freshman	5.43	1.28	6.05	1.36
	Sophomore	5.44	1.37	5.82	1.22
	Junior	5.36	1.27	5.98	0.94
	Senior	5.29	1.07	5.76	1.22
	University College	5.38	1.34	6.01	1.26
	Engineering	5.29	1.04	5.50	1.64
	Arts and Sciences	5.49	1.34	5.63	1.21
	Business Administration	5.61	0.84	6.11	0.68
	Journalism	4.85	1.39	5.75	1.35
	Education	5.00	0.0	5.93	1.13
	Other	5.33	0.71	6.17	0.41
	Caucasian	5.31	1.22	5.93	1.14
	Black	6.00	1.15	5.70	1.63
	Other	6.09	0.94	7.00	0.0
Men At Work	Overall	5.57	1.25	5.60	1.34
	Freshman	5.72	1.26	5.52	1.61
	Sophomore	5.72	1.26	5.82	1.09
	Junior	5.56	1.16	5.79	1.25
	Senior	5.36	1.32	5.43	1.17
	University College	5.70	1.24	5.54	1.48
	Engineering	5.59	0.99	5.83	0.75
	Arts and Sciences	5.38	1.60	5.81	0.96
	Business Administration	5.48	1.12	5.94	1.05
	Journalism	5.35	1.31	5.32	1.52
	Education	6.00	0.0	5.62	1.15
	Other	5.44	0.88	5.83	0.98
	Caucasian	5.52	1.23	5.64	1.23
	Black	6.10	1.10	5.30	1.91
	Other	5.91	1.76	6.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Confident-Unsure

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	3.80	1.42	3.24	1.42
	Freshman	3.83	1.34	3.17	1.60
	Sophomore	3.88	1.62	2.88	1.27
	Junior	3.74	1.48	3.30	1.40
	Senior	3.78	1.32	3.40	1.28
	University College	3.82	1.44	3.17	1.50
	Engineering	3.93	1.50	4.67	2.06
	Arts and Sciences	3.80	1.52	3.18	1.30
	Business Administration	3.77	1.17	3.33	1.19
	Journalism	3.65	1.31	3.20	1.20
	Education	3.00	0.0	3.14	1.41
	Other	3.33	1.66	3.50	1.05
	Caucasian	3.76	1.42	3.23	1.39
	Black	4.40	1.07	3.27	1.64
	Other	4.00	1.67	3.50	2.12
Men	Overall	2.64	1.16	2.69	1.29
	Freshman	2.45	0.99	2.69	1.50
	Sophomore	2.88	1.37	2.65	1.15
	Junior	2.59	1.21	2.61	1.14
	Senior	2.68	1.09	2.76	1.25
	University College	2.56	1.18	2.79	1.43
	Engineering	2.52	1.09	2.67	1.75
	Arts and Sciences	2.82	1.43	2.55	1.28
	Business Administration	2.48	0.93	2.28	1.02
	Journalism	2.70	1.03	2.57	1.11
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.86	1.16
	Other	2.55	0.88	2.17	0.75
	Caucasian	2.59	1.09	2.67	1.25
	Black	3.20	1.40	2.73	1.51
	Other	3.09	1.97	4.00	2.83

Table 51 - Continued

Confident-Unsure - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Home	Overall	3.24	1.48	3.34	1.80
	Freshman	3.04	1.45	3.23	1.95
	Sophomore	3.28	1.47	2.74	1.48
	Junior	3.38	1.61	3.71	1.78
	Senior	3.19	1.37	3.40	1.74
	University College	3.19	1.49	3.15	1.82
	Engineering	3.09	1.30	4.17	2.32
	Arts and Sciences	3.38	1.67	3.44	1.99
	Business Administration	3.16	1.39	3.50	1.65
	Journalism	3.65	1.50	3.80	1.71
	Education	4.00	0.0	3.14	1.68
	Other	2.89	1.45	2.83	1.94
	Caucasian	3.28	1.45	3.40	1.77
	Black	3.20	1.99	2.97	2.01
	Other	2.36	1.29	2.00	0.0
Men At Home	Overall	2.94	1.51	3.18	1.70
	Freshman	2.72	1.51	2.82	1.72
	Sophomore	3.21	1.71	3.03	1.57
	Junior	3.13	1.53	3.48	1.78
	Senior	2.76	1.33	3.39	1.65
	University College	3.05	1.63	2.91	1.69
	Engineering	2.81	1.27	3.50	1.64
	Arts and Sciences	3.07	1.56	3.07	1.36
	Business Administration	2.55	1.18	3.17	1.82
	Journalism	3.25	1.71	3.90	1.85
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.24	1.68
	Other	2.44	1.33	3.17	1.83
	Caucasian	2.94	1.48	3.17	1.65
	Black	3.30	2.06	3.33	2.01
	Other	2.55	1.51	1.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Confident-Unsure - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	2.49	1.17	1.89	1.05
	Freshman	2.47	1.29	1.71	1.14
	Sophomore	2.60	1.27	2.06	1.15
	Junior	2.26	0.98	1.96	1.09
	Senior	2.63	1.17	1.95	0.86
	University College	2.59	1.32	1.79	1.11
	Engineering	2.38	0.99	2.33	1.51
	Arts and Sciences	2.40	1.25	1.93	0.87
	Business Administration	2.22	0.76	1.89	0.76
	Journalism	2.75	1.16	1.92	0.97
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.10	1.26
	Other	2.44	0.88	2.00	0.63
	Caucasian	2.49	1.14	1.90	1.01
	Black	2.60	1.65	1.76	1.23
	Other	2.18	1.40	3.00	2.83
Men At Work	Overall	2.27	1.35	1.89	1.02
	Freshman	2.00	1.27	1.68	0.96
	Sophomore	2.16	1.40	2.12	1.17
	Junior	2.53	1.45	1.89	1.02
	Senior	2.27	1.25	2.03	0.99
	University College	2.13	1.33	1.82	1.00
	Engineering	2.24	1.23	2.17	1.47
	Arts and Sciences	2.51	1.60	2.04	1.05
	Business Administration	2.32	1.22	1.72	0.75
	Journalism	2.60	1.50	1.85	0.98
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.21	1.26
	Other	2.00	0.87	1.67	0.52
	Caucasian	2.28	1.31	1.86	0.96
	Black	1.70	0.95	2.06	1.39
	Other	2.73	2.24	2.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Sexy-Nonsexy

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women	Overall	2.24	1.09	2.64	1.11
	Freshman	2.11	1.07	2.64	1.22
	Sophomore	2.30	1.01	2.29	1.11
	Junior	2.25	1.14	2.86	1.13
	Senior	2.29	1.09	2.64	0.96
	University College	2.27	1.06	2.59	1.16
	Engineering	2.05	0.99	2.50	1.38
	Arts and Sciences	2.42	1.25	2.96	1.40
	Business Administration	2.16	1.00	2.67	0.77
	Journalism	2.35	1.18	2.50	0.90
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.65	1.04
	Other	2.11	1.05	3.17	0.98
	Caucasian	2.20	1.03	2.69	1.07
	Black	2.60	1.07	2.33	1.36
	Other	2.82	1.89	3.50	0.71
Men	Overall	3.87	1.37	2.63	1.25
	Freshmen	3.85	1.65	2.69	1.39
	Sophomore	4.12	1.50	2.50	1.31
	Junior	3.78	1.14	2.61	1.26
	Senior	3.79	1.26	2.61	1.06
	University College	3.87	1.51	2.72	1.39
	Engineering	3.93	1.42	2.33	1.37
	Arts and Sciences	3.80	1.38	2.63	0.97
	Business Administration	3.61	1.20	2.39	1.09
	Journalism	4.20	0.70	2.45	1.17
	Education	3.00	0.0	2.65	1.20
	Other	3.78	0.83	2.67	1.03
	Caucasian	3.89	1.35	2.63	1.23
	Black	3.50	1.35	2.64	1.43
	Other	3.55	1.63	2.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Sexy-Nonsexy - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Home	Overall	2.86	1.39	3.33	1.51
	Freshman	2.94	1.45	3.51	1.75
	Sophomore	3.12	1.37	2.91	1.36
	Junior	2.86	1.37	3.34	1.30
	Senior	2.67	1.37	3.32	1.43
	University College	2.98	1.39	3.43	1.62
	Engineering	2.40	1.17	3.50	1.38
	Arts and Sciences	2.91	1.50	3.07	1.54
	Business Administration	2.94	1.39	2.78	1.31
	Journalism	3.20	1.51	3.95	1.43
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.86	1.06
	Other	2.44	1.24	2.83	1.33
	Caucasian	2.84	1.35	3.36	1.45
	Black	3.20	1.75	3.27	1.86
	Other	3.00	1.90	3.00	2.83
Men At Home	Overall	3.71	1.32	3.32	1.58
	Freshman	3.57	1.62	3.37	1.73
	Sophomore	3.95	1.40	2.74	1.42
	Junior	3.75	1.20	3.57	1.76
	Senior	3.60	1.10	3.34	1.26
	University College	3.69	1.46	3.26	1.62
	Engineering	3.79	1.30	3.33	2.16
	Arts and Sciences	3.78	1.11	3.11	1.69
	Business Administration	3.61	1.38	3.05	1.51
	Journalism	3.80	0.77	3.80	1.40
	Education	4.00	0.0	3.17	1.47
	Other	3.11	1.27	3.33	1.03
	Caucasian	3.72	1.26	3.34	1.52
	Black	3.80	1.55	3.30	1.91
	Other	3.27	2.00	2.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Sexy-Nonsexy - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	2.85	1.31	2.73	1.28
	Freshman	2.77	1.42	2.58	1.24
	Sophomore	2.88	1.05	2.56	1.23
	Junior	2.89	1.40	2.79	1.44
	Senior	2.82	1.30	2.90	1.23
	University College	2.87	1.31	2.56	1.24
	Engineering	2.74	1.21	3.17	1.33
	Arts and Sciences	3.18	1.67	2.89	1.31
	Business Administration	2.58	0.99	2.72	1.18
	Journalism	2.70	1.08	2.57	1.43
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.17	1.26
	Other	2.67	1.22	3.50	0.84
	Caucasian	2.79	1.28	2.83	1.27
	Black	3.50	1.18	2.09	1.18
	Other	3.27	1.95	2.50	2.12
Men At Work	Overall	4.00	1.35	2.97	1.30
	Freshman	4.11	1.50	2.98	1.51
	Sophomore	4.02	1.28	2.79	1.32
	Junior	4.12	1.36	2.80	1.26
	Senior	3.77	1.23	3.15	1.07
	University College	4.03	1.33	2.96	1.44
	Engineering	3.76	1.34	3.17	1.17
	Arts and Sciences	4.15	1.46	2.85	1.29
	Business Administration	3.84	1.37	2.78	1.06
	Journalism	4.15	1.18	2.70	1.20
	Education	4.00	0.0	3.38	1.08
	Other	4.00	1.22	3.50	0.84
	Caucasian	4.00	1.33	3.00	1.23
	Black	3.70	0.67	2.82	1.72
	Other	4.09	1.97	3.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Direct-Evasive

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	4.28	1.56	3.72	1.61
	Freshman	4.08	1.66	3.81	1.75
	Sophomore	4.40	1.65	3.29	1.57
	Junior	4.42	1.43	3.75	1.54
	Senior	4.23	1.59	3.80	1.53
	University College	4.26	1.62	3.71	1.70
	Engineering	4.59	1.50	4.67	2.16
	Arts and Sciences	4.29	1.70	3.70	1.54
	Business Administration	4.45	1.23	3.78	1.17
	Journalism	3.45	1.43	3.82	1.74
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.31	1.26
	Other	4.55	1.59	3.50	1.22
	Caucasian	4.27	1.55	3.75	1.61
	Black	4.10	1.79	3.45	1.60
	Other	4.82	1.78	5.00	2.83
Men	Overall	2.67	1.10	2.84	1.46
	Freshman	2.51	1.20	2.70	1.57
	Sophomore	2.67	1.02	3.09	1.58
	Junior	2.67	1.15	2.82	1.36
	Senior	2.77	1.04	2.89	1.38
	University College	2.63	1.12	2.85	1.59
	Engineering	2.76	0.93	2.00	0.89
	Arts and Sciences	2.71	1.14	2.89	1.19
	Business Administration	2.81	1.28	2.83	1.10
	Journalism	2.60	1.09	3.30	1.71
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.48	1.06
	Other	2.22	0.97	2.33	1.03
	Caucasian	2.63	1.08	2.83	1.45
	Black	2.90	1.10	2.85	1.50
	Other	3.27	1.49	1.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Direct-Evasive - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Home	Overall	3.33	1.47	3.44	1.60
	Freshman	3.55	1.67	3.32	1.76
	Sophomore	3.30	1.52	3.24	1.54
	Junior	3.22	1.48	3.86	1.59
	Senior	3.29	1.30	3.31	1.38
	University College	3.40	1.62	3.30	1.67
	Engineering	3.29	1.44	4.33	1.86
	Arts and Sciences	3.24	1.46	3.74	1.56
	Business Administration	3.26	1.21	3.67	1.19
	Journalism	3.55	1.43	3.60	1.58
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.00	1.39
	Other	3.00	1.00	3.17	1.60
	Caucasian	3.35	1.48	3.49	1.56
	Black	3.60	1.78	3.15	1.79
	Other	2.64	0.92	2.50	2.12
Men At Home	Overall	2.96	1.35	2.98	1.53
	Freshman	2.79	1.54	2.64	1.62
	Sophomore	3.19	1.40	2.50	1.35
	Junior	2.91	1.24	3.39	1.56
	Senior	3.02	1.29	3.20	1.34
	University College	3.05	1.52	2.65	1.52
	Engineering	3.07	1.30	3.00	1.26
	Arts and Sciences	3.07	1.29	3.33	1.82
	Business Administration	2.84	1.19	3.05	1.26
	Journalism	2.70	1.13	3.67	1.44
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.86	1.33
	Other	2.22	0.67	3.00	1.55
	Caucasian	2.98	1.34	3.05	1.52
	Black	3.00	1.94	2.55	1.50
	Other	2.73	1.01	1.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Direct-Evasive - Continued

Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Work	Overall	2.63	1.12	1.96	0.99
	Freshman	2.60	1.26	1.77	0.99
	Sophomore	2.67	1.17	2.06	1.01
	Junior	2.53	1.03	1.96	0.95
	Senior	2.71	1.09	2.14	1.01
	University College	2.67	1.20	1.85	0.98
	Engineering	2.81	1.04	2.00	1.09
	Arts and Sciences	2.55	1.16	2.07	0.78
	Business Administration	2.19	0.91	2.11	1.08
	Journalism	2.90	1.07	2.07	1.05
	Education	2.00	0.0	1.90	0.90
	Other	2.55	0.88	2.17	0.41
	Caucasian	2.63	1.11	1.98	0.98
	Black	2.40	1.26	1.82	1.07
	Other	2.64	1.36	2.50	2.12
Men At Work	Overall	2.35	1.33	2.00	1.11
	Freshman	2.23	1.34	1.77	1.11
	Sophomore	2.32	1.51	2.12	1.30
	Junior	2.49	1.39	1.91	1.03
	Senior	2.32	1.16	2.26	1.05
	University College	2.27	1.40	1.86	1.13
	Engineering	2.36	1.16	1.67	0.82
	Arts and Sciences	2.73	1.57	2.15	1.10
	Business Administration	2.19	1.14	2.17	0.92
	Journalism	2.35	1.09	2.27	1.26
	Education	2.00	0.0	1.97	0.98
	Other	1.89	0.78	2.17	0.98
	Caucasian	2.36	1.31	2.03	1.11
	Black	2.20	1.69	1.82	1.13
	Other	2.36	1.43	2.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Careful-Impulsive

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women	Overall	4.21	1.61	3.76	1.66
	Freshman	4.40	1.57	3.49	1.84
	Sophomore	3.93	1.67	3.82	1.55
	Junior	4.09	1.64	3.86	1.59
	Senior	4.32	1.55	3.95	1.54
	University College	4.19	1.58	3.69	1.79
	Engineering	4.38	1.78	4.50	2.07
	Arts and Sciences	4.02	1.62	3.81	1.49
	Business Administration	3.90	1.40	3.89	1.32
	Journalism	4.15	1.56	3.87	1.74
	Education	5.00	0.0	3.72	1.39
	Other	5.44	1.51	3.67	1.21
	Caucasian	4.28	1.57	3.81	1.61
	Black	3.20	1.48	3.24	1.87
	Other	3.36	1.96	6.00	1.41
Men	Overall	3.62	1.56	3.66	1.57
	Freshman	3.79	1.70	3.75	1.71
	Sophomore	3.42	1.79	3.68	1.57
	Junior	3.55	1.59	3.50	1.38
	Senior	3.67	1.30	3.68	1.57
	University College	3.59	1.71	3.74	1.67
	Engineering	3.31	1.14	2.67	1.21
	Arts and Sciences	3.64	1.63	3.41	1.45
	Business Administration	4.00	1.46	3.67	1.08
	Journalism	3.60	1.46	3.87	1.54
	Education	5.00	0.0	3.52	1.64
	Other	3.78	1.86	3.50	1.76
	Caucasian	3.60	1.52	3.66	1.54
	Black	4.20	1.99	3.76	1.68
	Other	3.45	1.97	1.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Careful-Impulsive - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Home	Overall	3.27	1.47	2.88	1.62
	Freshman	3.28	1.49	2.95	1.84
	Sophomore	3.12	1.45	2.68	1.41
	Junior	3.31	1.57	2.93	1.50
	Senior	3.31	1.40	2.80	1.52
	University College	3.26	1.47	2.74	1.64
	Engineering	3.21	1.39	2.67	1.63
	Arts and Sciences	3.07	1.48	3.52	1.67
	Business Administration	3.22	1.45	2.89	1.71
	Journalism	4.00	1.59	3.05	1.63
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.38	1.27
	Other	3.30	1.50	2.33	1.03
	Caucasian	3.34	1.46	2.92	1.59
	Black	2.30	1.16	2.48	1.72
	Other	2.64	1.69	3.50	2.12
Men At Home	Overall	3.23	1.40	3.11	1.55
	Freshman	3.40	1.75	2.86	1.61
	Sophomore	3.37	1.53	3.12	1.66
	Junior	3.06	1.16	3.37	1.54
	Senior	3.21	1.28	3.15	1.40
	University College	3.40	1.59	2.94	1.57
	Engineering	3.36	1.51	3.67	1.97
	Arts and Sciences	2.98	1.16	2.89	1.37
	Business Administration	2.97	1.20	3.11	1.45
	Journalism	3.20	1.10	3.62	1.51
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.03	1.52
	Other	3.11	0.78	2.83	1.47
	Caucasian	3.24	1.38	3.17	1.51
	Black	3.60	1.90	2.57	1.64
	Other	2.64	1.36	2.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Careful-Impulsive - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	2.81	1.29	2.25	1.26
	Freshman	2.89	1.49	2.04	1.39
	Sophomore	2.72	1.30	2.26	1.21
	Junior	2.80	1.32	2.50	1.29
	Senior	2.82	1.10	2.30	1.08
	University College	2.85	1.40	2.13	1.37
	Engineering	2.81	1.25	2.17	0.75
	Arts and Sciences	2.67	1.21	2.33	0.92
	Business Administration	2.68	1.19	2.44	0.78
	Journalism	3.00	1.26	2.27	1.15
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.28	1.36
	Other	3.22	3.00		
	Caucasian	2.87	1.27	2.30	1.26
	Black	2.50	1.65	1.97	1.29
	Other	1.91	0.70	2.00	0.0
Men At Work	Overall	2.58	1.36	2.35	1.30
	Freshman	2.30	1.25	2.23	1.48
	Sophomore	2.53	1.58	2.50	1.31
	Junior	2.70	1.31	2.29	1.23
	Senior	2.68	1.34	2.46	1.15
	University College	2.50	1.46	2.31	1.46
	Engineering	2.67	1.36	1.83	0.75
	Arts and Sciences	2.58	1.42	2.15	0.82
	Business Administration	2.71	1.19	2.50	1.10
	Journalism	2.65	1.18	2.60	1.32
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.17	1.17
	Other	2.55	1.01	2.67	1.51
	Caucasian	2.60	1.35	2.36	1.30
	Black	2.60	1.71	2.30	1.33
	Other	2.09	1.22	1.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Logical-Illogical

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women	Overall	4.29	1.54	3.19	1.34
	Freshman	4.26	1.39	3.08	1.47
	Sophomores	4.30	1.72	3.12	1.20
	Juniors	4.29	1.50	3.12	1.22
	Seniors	4.29	1.31	3.36	1.36
	University College	4.25	1.49	3.13	1.40
	Engineering	4.29	1.49	3.83	1.83
	Arts and Sciences	4.55	1.47	3.30	1.20
	Business Administration	4.00	1.26	3.05	1.05
	Journalism	4.10	1.26	3.07	1.40
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.38	1.12
	Other	5.00	1.73	3.00	1.55
	Caucasian	4.32	1.43	3.19	1.31
	Black	3.80	1.93	3.12	1.58
	Other	4.09	1.58	3.50	0.71
Men	Overall	2.66	1.11	2.85	1.22
	Freshman	2.75	1.24	2.82	1.39
	Sophomore	2.53	1.16	2.50	1.02
	Junior	2.80	1.06	2.84	1.11
	Senior	2.52	1.03	3.04	1.18
	University College	2.67	1.19	2.80	1.32
	Engineering	2.45	1.09	2.33	0.52
	Arts and Sciences	2.73	1.12	2.81	0.96
	Business Administration	2.77	1.02	2.78	0.94
	Journalism	2.65	1.04	3.30	1.20
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.65	1.32
	Other	2.89	0.78	2.83	0.98
	Caucasian	2.67	1.11	2.73	1.10
	Black	2.60	0.97	3.45	1.66
	Other	2.55	1.21	3.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Logical-Illogical - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	3.40	1.32	3.00	1.54
	Freshman	3.36	1.35	2.88	1.72
	Senior	3.40	1.48	2.97	1.31
	Junior	3.38	1.36	3.21	1.58
	Senior	3.46	1.18	2.96	1.40
	University College	3.38	1.39	2.90	1.60
	Engineering	3.38	1.25	3.33	1.51
	Arts and Sciences	3.47	1.22	3.30	1.75
	Business Administration	3.26	1.24	2.72	1.27
	Journalism	3.95	1.47	3.40	1.57
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.62	1.29
	Other	2.89	1.05	2.83	1.17
	Caucasian	3.45	1.30	3.00	1.49
	Black	2.80	1.48	2.91	1.84
	Other	3.00	1.55	4.50	0.71
Men At Home	Overall	2.93	1.23	2.96	1.49
	Freshman	2.79	1.35	2.69	1.53
	Sophomore	3.14	1.23	2.65	1.37
	Junior	3.03	1.18	3.37	1.59
	Senior	2.83	1.19	3.07	1.36
	University College	2.98	1.31	2.68	1.36
	Engineering	3.00	1.27	3.67	2.34
	Arts and Sciences	2.95	1.02	3.30	1.77
	Business Administration	2.71	1.16	2.72	1.07
	Journalism	3.05	1.32	3.77	1.67
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.76	1.15
	Other	2.78	1.09	2.50	1.05
	Caucasian	2.95	1.22	2.99	1.46
	Black	3.30	1.64	2.79	1.73
	Other	2.36	0.92	2.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Logical-Illogical - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	2.74	1.19	1.98	0.96
	Freshman	2.81	1.27	1.77	0.99
	Sophomore	2.65	1.19	2.00	0.95
	Junior	2.68	1.18	2.00	0.91
	Senior	2.78	1.18	2.18	0.93
	University College	2.76	1.22	1.84	0.95
	Engineering	2.81	1.21	1.67	0.52
	Arts and Sciences	2.71	1.31	2.11	1.01
	Business Administration	2.42	0.81	2.22	0.94
	Journalism	3.00	1.41	2.10	1.01
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.03	0.87
	Other	2.78	0.97	2.17	0.41
	Caucasian	2.78	1.21	1.95	0.90
	Black	2.10	1.10	2.15	1.30
	Other	2.45	0.82	2.00	0.0
Men At Work	Overall	2.19	1.02	2.00	0.98
	Freshman	2.15	1.18	1.90	1.12
	Sophomore	1.98	0.83	1.97	0.87
	Junior	2.30	1.06	1.95	0.92
	Senior	2.22	0.97	2.16	0.94
	University College	2.15	1.07	1.95	1.05
	Engineering	2.26	1.01	1.67	0.82
	Arts and Sciences	2.29	1.14	2.04	0.90
	Business Administration	2.03	0.80	2.00	0.97
	Journalism	2.30	1.08	2.22	1.10
	Education	2.00	0.0	1.97	0.82
	Other	2.11	0.78	1.83	0.41
	Caucasian	2.20	1.02	1.98	0.93
	Black	2.00	1.25	2.12	1.34
	Other	2.18	0.98	1.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Pleasant-Unpleasant

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	2.31	1.02	2.53	1.12
	Freshman	2.30	1.04	2.37	1.17
	Sophomore	2.23	1.11	2.26	0.93
	Junior	2.33	1.01	2.71	1.20
	Senior	2.36	0.97	2.69	1.06
	University College	2.31	1.10	2.35	1.15
	Engineering	2.40	0.91	3.67	1.37
	Arts and Sciences	2.38	1.17	2.96	1.16
	Business Administration	2.19	0.83	2.55	0.85
	Journalism	2.20	0.77	2.42	0.93
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.76	1.12
	Other	2.44	0.88	2.67	1.21
	Caucasian	2.30	0.97	2.56	1.10
	Black	2.40	1.58	2.30	1.24
	Other	2.64	1.36	3.50	0.71
Men	Overall	3.20	1.08	2.75	1.16
	Freshman	3.23	1.07	2.58	1.23
	Sophomore	3.37	1.29	2.47	0.99
	Junior	3.14	1.07	2.75	1.12
	Senior	3.13	0.97	3.03	1.12
	University College	3.25	1.17	2.56	1.16
	Engineering	3.24	0.96	2.33	0.52
	Arts and Sciences	3.22	1.13	3.00	1.00
	Business Administration	3.13	0.92	2.61	0.92
	Journalism	3.05	1.05	3.10	1.26
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.90	1.23
	Other	3.00	1.00	3.17	0.98
	Caucasian	3.18	1.07	2.71	1.11
	Black	3.50	0.71	3.00	1.41
	Other	3.27	1.42	2.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Pleasant-Unpleasant - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Home	Overall	2.55	1.14	2.52	1.33
	Freshman	2.68	1.31	2.58	1.54
	Sophomore	2.51	1.20	2.38	1.30
	Junior	2.50	1.17	2.59	1.25
	Senior	2.54	0.95	2.47	1.17
	University College	2.62	1.27	2.65	1.51
	Engineering	2.55	0.97	1.83	1.17
	Arts and Sciences	2.53	1.08	2.67	1.36
	Business Administration	2.32	0.83	1.94	0.94
	Journalism	2.80	1.40	2.65	1.14
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.38	0.98
	Other	2.22	0.97	1.83	0.75
	Caucasian	2.58	1.14	2.51	1.29
	Black	2.10	1.20	2.73	1.62
	Other	2.27	1.01	1.50	0.71
Men At Home	Overall	3.13	1.29	2.98	1.37
	Freshman	3.02	1.41	2.92	1.47
	Sophomore	3.40	1.59	2.50	1.24
	Junior	3.13	1.31	3.23	1.50
	Senior	3.08	0.98	3.07	1.16
	University College	3.22	1.52	2.83	1.40
	Engineering	3.12	1.04	4.33	1.37
	Arts and Sciences	3.04	1.15	3.00	1.44
	Business Administration	2.81	1.05	2.72	0.96
	Journalism	3.50	1.36	3.45	1.45
	Education	3.00	0.0	2.86	1.19
	Other	3.11	0.78	2.33	1.03
	Caucasian	3.14	1.25	2.97	1.34
	Black	3.60	1.78	3.09	1.51
	Other	2.55	1.51	2.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Pleasant-Unpleasant - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	3.02	1.31	2.98	1.37
	Freshman	3.21	1.47	2.92	1.47
	Sophomore	3.00	1.11	2.50	1.24
	Junior	2.95	1.34	3.23	1.50
	Senior	2.99	1.26	3.07	1.16
	University College	3.14	1.36	2.83	1.40
	Engineering	2.79	1.22	4.33	1.37
	Arts and Sciences	3.31	1.49	3.00	1.44
	Business Administration	2.84	0.86	2.72	0.96
	Journalism	2.85	1.35	3.45	1.45
	Education	4.00	0.0	2.86	1.19
	Other	2.33	1.00	2.33	1.03
	Caucasian	3.06	1.27	2.97	1.34
	Black	2.60	1.51	3.09	1.51
	Other	2.64	1.80	2.50	2.12
Men At Work	Overall	3.31	1.18	2.41	1.23
	Freshman	3.28	1.26	2.40	1.34
	Sophomore	3.53	1.33	2.29	1.29
	Junior	3.43	1.19	2.34	1.20
	Senior	3.09	1.00	2.49	1.09
	University College	3.37	1.31	2.32	1.25
	Engineering	3.26	0.99	3.00	1.09
	Arts and Sciences	3.29	1.31	2.33	0.96
	Business Administration	3.06	0.81	2.17	0.92
	Journalism	3.50	1.23	2.30	1.22
	Education	3.00	0.0	2.59	1.21
	Other	3.44	0.88	2.67	1.21
	Caucasian	3.31	1.15	2.46	1.19
	Black	4.00	1.70	2.06	1.34
	Other	2.82	1.17	2.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Boring-Interesting

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	5.20	1.32	5.01	1.25
	Freshman	5.36	1.19	5.18	1.30
	Sophomore	5.21	1.41	5.15	1.16
	Junior	5.29	1.27	4.98	1.34
	Senior	4.99	1.39	4.78	1.16
	University College	5.32	1.19	5.13	1.26
	Engineering	5.07	1.55	4.17	1.60
	Arts and Sciences	5.18	1.50	4.74	1.43
	Business Administration	5.22	1.09	5.11	0.83
	Journalism	4.90	1.33	5.05	1.28
	Education	7.00	0.0	5.03	1.27
	Other	4.78	1.30	4.33	0.52
	Caucasian	5.19	1.30	4.87	1.21
	Black	4.70	1.83	5.30	1.45
	Other	5.82	0.98	4.50	2.12
Men	Overall	4.71	1.26	5.17	1.25
	Freshman	4.72	1.28	5.06	1.38
	Sophomore	4.65	1.15	5.27	1.24
	Junior	4.79	1.33	5.27	1.29
	Senior	4.67	1.26	5.22	1.09
	University College	4.73	1.24	5.07	1.37
	Engineering	4.67	1.20	5.17	1.33
	Arts and Sciences	4.69	1.36	5.33	0.83
	Business Administration	4.74	1.15	5.17	1.15
	Journalism	4.55	1.57	5.25	1.21
	Education	6.00	0.0	5.31	1.26
	Other	5.00	1.12	5.17	0.98
	Caucasian	4.72	1.27	5.17	1.18
	Black	4.40	0.70	5.15	1.72
	Other	4.73	1.49	6.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Boring-Interesting - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	4.43	1.47	4.04	1.68
	Freshman	4.66	1.57	3.84	1.87
	Sophomore	4.40	1.45	4.50	1.66
	Junior	4.47	1.46	4.04	1.67
	Senior	4.27	1.40	4.08	1.46
	University College	4.53	1.53	4.01	1.79
	Engineering	4.79	1.32	3.00	0.89
	Arts and Sciences	4.15	1.43	4.15	1.63
	Business Administration	4.35	1.35	4.61	1.42
	Journalism	3.75	1.65	3.65	1.78
	Education	6.00	0.0	4.52	1.45
	Other	4.78	0.97	4.50	0.84
	Caucasian	4.45	1.45	4.02	1.63
	Black	3.80	1.62	4.09	2.02
	Other	4.73	1.68	5.00	1.41
Men At Home	Overall	4.37	1.42	4.20	1.68
	Freshman	4.81	1.43	4.19	1.93
	Sophomore	4.30	1.39	4.47	1.44
	Junior	4.38	1.48	4.18	1.72
	Senior	4.09	1.32	4.14	1.47
	University College	4.57	1.49	4.20	1.83
	Engineering	4.29	1.11	3.50	1.38
	Arts and Sciences	4.11	1.51	4.48	1.50
	Business Administration	4.55	1.36	4.33	1.57
	Journalism	3.55	1.36	3.90	1.86
	Education	5.00	0.0	4.52	1.30
	Other	4.89	1.17	4.00	0.63
	Caucasian	4.36	1.42	4.21	1.62
	Black	4.00	1.63	4.06	2.08
	Other	4.82	1.25	5.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Boring-Interesting - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Work	Overall	4.89	1.31	5.53	1.43
	Freshman	4.68	1.40	5.42	1.64
	Sophomore	4.72	1.58	5.76	1.16
	Junior	5.09	1.16	5.82	1.13
	Senior	4.95	1.23	5.32	1.47
	University College	4.75	1.47	5.54	1.50
	Engineering	5.09	1.19	4.67	1.75
	Arts and Sciences	4.91	1.31	5.70	1.23
	Business Administration	5.10	1.11	5.72	1.45
	Journalism	4.80	1.20	5.77	1.23
	Education	5.00	0.0	5.34	1.47
	Other	5.11	1.05	4.83	1.33
	Caucasian	4.86	1.30	5.58	1.34
	Black	4.90	1.85	5.21	1.83
	Other	5.55	1.04	4.50	3.55
Men At Work	Overall	4.74	1.35	5.05	1.50
	Freshman	4.47	1.34	5.07	1.66
	Sophomore	4.79	1.50	5.29	1.45
	Junior	4.93	1.24	5.18	1.43
	Senior	4.72	1.37	4.82	1.39
	University College	4.62	1.43	5.04	1.59
	Engineering	4.81	1.31	4.83	1.83
	Arts and Sciences	4.49	1.52	5.41	1.12
	Business Administration	5.03	1.02	5.44	1.20
	Journalism	5.10	1.07	5.10	1.55
	Education	5.00	0.0	4.83	1.54
	Other	5.22	1.09	4.17	0.98
	Caucasian	4.73	1.32	5.10	1.39
	Black	4.40	1.58	4.76	2.05
	Other	5.27	1.68	4.50	3.54

Table 51 - Continued

Rational-Irrational

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	4.04	1.50	3.34	1.45
	Freshman	4.19	1.61	3.32	1.64
	Sophomore	4.21	1.73	3.15	1.23
	Junior	3.91	1.47	3.18	1.38
	Senior	3.95	1.31	3.57	1.37
	University College	4.21	1.57	3.26	1.53
	Engineering	3.81	1.27	3.50	1.38
	Arts and Sciences	3.98	1.53	3.74	1.56
	Business Administration	3.71	1.49	3.33	1.53
	Journalism	4.15	1.60	3.30	1.30
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.14	1.19
	Other	4.44	1.01	3.50	1.22
	Caucasian	4.08	1.50	3.31	1.41
	Black	3.90	1.37	3.57	1.71
	Other	3.09	1.38	3.50	0.71
Men	Overall	2.78	1.09	3.04	1.27
	Freshman	2.91	1.38	3.06	1.41
	Sophomore	2.70	1.08	2.82	1.11
	Junior	2.75	0.98	2.91	1.13
	Senior	2.78	1.00	3.20	1.30
	University College	2.83	1.26	3.02	1.31
	Engineering	2.57	0.86	2.33	1.21
	Arts and Sciences	2.78	1.02	2.81	0.92
	Business Administration	2.77	0.88	2.89	1.02
	Journalism	3.00	1.26	3.52	1.36
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.03	1.40
	Other	2.89	0.78	2.83	1.33
	Caucasian	2.76	1.10	3.00	1.24
	Black	3.00	1.05	3.33	1.47
	Other	3.00	1.09	2.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Rational-Irrational - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	3.37	1.34	3.01	1.36
	Freshman	3.51	1.50	3.01	1.50
	Sophomore	3.28	1.58	2.91	1.36
	Junior	3.39	1.24	3.20	1.34
	Senior	3.31	1.19	2.93	1.20
	University College	3.44	1.50	2.95	1.42
	Engineering	3.38	1.19	3.33	1.63
	Arts and Sciences	3.38	1.23	3.41	1.62
	Business Administration	3.19	1.19	2.67	1.03
	Journalism	3.35	1.42	3.17	1.39
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.97	0.94
	Other	3.44	1.01	2.50	0.84
	Caucasian	3.38	1.34	3.01	1.29
	Black	3.00	1.56	3.06	1.71
	Other	3.45	1.13	3.50	2.12
Men At Home	Overall	2.92	1.25	3.08	1.30
	Freshman	3.06	1.42	3.13	1.35
	Sophomore	2.88	1.33	2.65	1.15
	Junior	2.84	1.11	3.14	1.41
	Senior	2.95	1.23	3.14	1.22
	University College	3.00	1.39	2.98	1.27
	Engineering	3.07	1.30	4.67	1.75
	Arts and Sciences	2.93	1.25	2.96	1.31
	Business Administration	2.61	0.92	2.94	1.16
	Journalism	2.80	0.95	3.47	1.38
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.79	1.14
	Other	2.89	0.93	2.67	1.21
	Caucasian	2.92	1.24	3.02	1.25
	Black	3.30	1.64	3.48	1.52
	Other	2.73	1.01	2.50	2.12

Table 51 - Continued

Rational-Irrational - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	2.80	1.16	2.12	1.03
	Freshman	2.83	1.19	2.15	1.21
	Sophomore	2.77	1.31	2.00	0.92
	Junior	2.78	1.17	1.98	0.88
	Senior	2.82	1.07	2.24	0.99
	University College	2.87	1.22	2.12	1.13
	Engineering	2.98	1.35	2.50	1.22
	Arts and Sciences	2.71	1.12	1.85	0.91
	Business Administration	2.45	0.81	2.00	0.84
	Journalism	2.85	1.04	2.20	0.88
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.17	0.97
	Other	2.78	0.97	2.00	0.0
	Caucasian	2.82	1.17	2.09	1.00
	Black	2.60	1.35	2.30	1.24
	Other	2.64	0.92	2.50	2.12
Men At Work	Overall	2.37	1.13	2.18	1.11
	Freshman	2.49	1.23	2.24	1.34
	Sophomore	2.28	1.30	1.97	0.90
	Junior	2.37	1.07	2.11	1.17
	Senior	2.33	1.05	2.27	0.86
	University College	2.43	1.26	2.15	1.21
	Engineering	2.29	1.02	2.17	0.75
	Arts and Sciences	2.38	1.07	2.00	0.73
	Business Administration	2.22	0.99	1.94	1.00
	Journalism	2.55	1.19	2.40	1.26
	Education	1.00	0.0	2.21	0.86
	Other	2.22	0.97	2.17	0.41
	Caucasian	2.35	1.12	2.15	1.05
	Black	2.80	1.48	2.33	1.45
	Other	2.27	1.10	2.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Dependent-SelfReliant

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women	Overall	3.56	1.32	3.92	1.58
	Freshman	3.73	1.40	4.07	1.77
	Sophomore	3.63	1.40	4.18	1.38
	Junior	3.39	1.34	3.80	1.68
	Senior	3.59	1.21	3.72	1.37
	University College	3.65	1.35	4.13	1.65
	Engineering	3.86	1.32	3.00	1.55
	Arts and Sciences	3.53	1.29	3.59	1.62
	Business Administration	3.42	1.26	4.55	1.50
	Journalism	3.05	1.28	3.80	1.43
	Education	5.00	0.0	3.28	1.28
	Other	3.00	1.22	3.33	1.75
	Caucasian	3.58	1.35	3.92	1.52
	Black	2.70	0.82	3.76	1.92
	Other	4.09	0.83	5.00	1.41
Men	Overall	4.98	1.74	5.10	1.74
	Freshman	5.08	1.86	5.00	2.12
	Sophomore	4.79	1.88	5.47	1.33
	Junior	5.01	1.68	5.09	1.62
	Senior	4.97	1.66	5.03	1.54
	University College	5.02	1.81	5.02	1.92
	Engineering	4.86	1.75	6.33	0.82
	Arts and Sciences	4.84	1.73	5.67	0.96
	Business Administration	5.35	1.38	5.94	0.94
	Journalism	4.90	1.74	4.80	1.68
	Education	5.00	0.0	4.55	1.92
	Other	4.55	2.30	4.67	1.75
	Caucasian	4.98	1.76	5.11	1.68
	Black	5.10	1.79	4.97	2.17
	Other	4.82	1.40	6.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Dependent-SelfReliant - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	3.34	1.72	3.34	1.96
	Freshman	3.43	1.84	3.27	2.14
	Sophomore	3.56	1.79	3.91	2.02
	Junior	3.09	1.73	2.87	1.81
	Senior	3.36	1.55	3.55	1.80
	University College	3.41	1.80	3.35	2.05
	Engineering	3.50	1.47	2.33	1.97
	Arts and Sciences	3.49	1.93	3.37	1.96
	Business Administration	2.77	1.43	2.94	1.66
	Journalism	3.05	1.47	3.00	1.78
	Education	5.00	0.0	4.00	2.02
	Other	3.11	1.96	4.17	1.83
	Caucasian	3.34	1.69	3.42	1.94
	Black	3.10	1.73	3.06	2.21
	Other	3.18	2.23	2.50	0.71
Men At Home	Overall	4.37	1.80	4.07	1.89
	Freshman	4.81	1.79	3.90	2.02
	Sophomore	4.14	1.91	4.41	1.94
	Junior	4.29	1.81	4.18	1.89
	Senior	4.28	1.73	4.04	1.73
	University College	4.38	1.89	4.07	1.97
	Engineering	4.21	1.62	3.67	1.63
	Arts and Sciences	4.69	1.75	4.37	1.64
	Business Administration	4.29	1.77	4.28	1.99
	Journalism	4.15	1.98	3.52	1.95
	Education	2.00	0.0	4.65	1.59
	Other	4.44	1.75	4.33	1.86
	Caucasian	4.38	1.77	4.15	1.83
	Black	4.00	2.11	3.55	2.24
	Other	4.45	2.25	5.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Dependent-SelfReliant - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Work	Overall	4.84	1.59	5.26	1.93
	Freshman	4.75	1.80	4.75	2.44
	Sophomore	4.79	1.73	5.47	1.73
	Junior	5.11	1.47	5.55	1.74
	Senior	4.67	1.47	5.51	1.34
	University College	4.75	1.73	5.01	2.25
	Engineering	4.45	1.63	6.17	0.98
	Arts and Sciences	4.91	1.58	5.30	1.68
	Business Administration	5.55	1.15	5.78	1.21
	Journalism	4.85	1.09	5.47	1.60
	Education	6.00	0.0	5.17	1.91
	Other	4.78	1.64	6.00	0.0
	Caucasian	4.81	1.59	5.47	1.74
	Black	4.50	1.96	3.82	2.49
	Other	5.73	1.01	6.00	0.0
Men At Work	Overall	5.09	1.93	5.54	1.87
	Freshman	5.00	2.21	5.21	2.23
	Sophomore	4.84	2.17	5.71	1.77
	Junior	5.06	1.84	5.86	1.54
	Senior	5.29	1.67	5.59	1.69
	University College	4.84	2.16	5.42	2.02
	Engineering	4.93	1.70	6.83	0.41
	Arts and Sciences	5.02	1.91	5.78	1.50
	Business Administration	5.74	1.48	5.11	2.27
	Journalism	5.75	1.33	5.60	1.74
	Education	6.00	0.0	5.48	1.90
	Other	5.00	2.34	6.50	0.55
	Caucasian	5.10	1.93	5.68	1.75
	Black	4.60	2.32	4.61	2.44
	Other	5.27	1.74	6.00	1.41

Table 51 - Continued

Ambitious-Unambitious

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women	Overall	3.14	1.19	2.74	1.28
	Freshman	3.15	1.29	2.51	1.32
	Sophomore	3.12	1.16	2.44	1.40
	Junior	3.18	1.14	2.82	1.13
	Senior	3.09	1.20	3.05	1.23
	University College	3.16	1.24	2.54	1.34
	Engineering	3.12	1.04	3.33	1.97
	Arts and Sciences	3.24	1.33	2.93	1.24
	Business Administration	2.87	0.81	2.72	0.96
	Journalism	3.45	1.43	3.12	1.24
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.83	1.14
	Other	2.78	0.97	2.33	0.52
	Caucasian	3.11	1.17	2.78	1.24
	Black	3.60	0.84	2.39	1.41
	Other	3.18	1.78	4.50	2.12
Men	Overall	2.42	1.16	2.21	1.24
	Freshman	2.30	1.07	2.04	1.29
	Sophomore	2.35	1.21	2.29	1.27
	Junior	2.41	1.24	2.09	1.03
	Senior	2.56	1.11	2.43	1.30
	University College	2.31	1.11	2.08	1.28
	Engineering	2.55	1.21	1.83	0.41
	Arts and Sciences	2.47	1.27	2.26	0.76
	Business Administration	2.32	1.14	2.44	1.38
	Journalism	2.90	1.25	2.47	1.36
	Education	3.00	0.0	2.10	1.32
	Other	2.11	0.61	2.50	1.22
	Caucasian	2.38	1.10	2.11	1.09
	Black	2.50	1.51	2.79	1.90
	Other	3.18	1.72	2.00	0.0

Table 51 -- Continued

Ambitious-Unambitious - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	4.03	1.60	4.09	1.86
	Freshman	4.17	1.67	3.95	2.04
	Sophomore	3.91	1.59	3.50	1.83
	Junior	4.12	1.63	4.59	1.77
	Senior	3.91	1.55	4.12	1.68
	University College	4.10	1.65	3.97	1.95
	Engineering	4.05	1.56	4.83	1.83
	Arts and Sciences	3.82	1.50	4.15	1.79
	Business Administration	4.10	1.58	4.28	1.56
	Journalism	4.25	1.89	4.57	1.91
	Education	3.00	0.0	3.69	1.75
	Other	3.55	1.51	4.33	1.21
	Caucasian	4.03	1.60	4.14	1.81
	Black	4.00	1.94	3.73	2.18
	Other	4.00	1.41	4.00	2.83
Men At Home	Overall	3.50	1.60	3.69	1.78
	Freshman	3.25	1.67	3.44	1.88
	Sophomore	3.60	1.69	3.56	1.76
	Junior	3.56	1.52	4.00	1.81
	Senior	3.55	1.59	3.77	1.65
	University College	3.45	1.71	3.49	1.80
	Engineering	3.57	1.56	4.83	2.23
	Arts and Sciences	3.67	1.51	3.55	1.74
	Business Administration	3.16	1.67	3.72	1.87
	Journalism	3.50	1.50	4.07	1.80
	Education	4.00	0.0	3.48	1.50
	Other	4.00	1.00	3.83	1.83
	Caucasian	3.48	1.57	3.77	1.79
	Black	4.10	2.13	3.18	1.65
	Other	3.36	1.86	3.50	3.54

Table 51 - Continued

Ambitious-Unambitions - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	2.33	1.13	1.75	1.02
	Freshman	2.28	1.25	1.69	1.17
	Sophomore	2.47	1.22	1.82	1.24
	Junior	2.26	1.01	1.68	0.90
	Senior	2.32	1.10	1.82	0.82
	University College	2.35	1.21	1.72	1.19
	Engineering	2.33	0.98	1.50	0.84
	Arts and Sciences	2.44	1.22	1.70	0.72
	Business Administration	2.13	0.92	1.61	0.70
	Journalism	2.30	1.17	1.85	1.00
	Education	1.00	0.0	1.76	0.91
	Other	2.11	0.93	2.17	0.41
	Caucasian	2.31	1.09	1.78	1.04
	Black	2.10	1.29	1.57	0.90
	Other	2.73	1.56	1.50	0.71
Men At Work	Overall	2.09	1.14	1.82	1.07
	Freshman	1.98	1.08	1.77	1.13
	Sophomore	1.98	1.08	1.82	1.36
	Junior	2.13	1.09	1.79	0.93
	Senior	2.21	1.25	1.88	0.98
	University College	1.97	1.00	1.81	1.18
	Engineering	2.24	1.12	2.00	1.09
	Arts and Sciences	2.35	1.43	1.55	0.64
	Business Administration	1.84	0.82	1.78	0.88
	Journalism	2.20	1.28	2.07	1.27
	Education	2.00	0.0	1.76	0.87
	Other	2.22	1.56	1.67	0.52
	Caucasian	2.10	1.11	1.84	1.08
	Black	1.60	0.70	1.64	1.06
	Other	2.36	1.80	2.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Soft-Hard

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	2.25	0.96	2.40	1.07
	Freshman	2.06	0.86	2.22	1.02
	Sophomore	2.25	0.81	2.50	1.31
	Junior	2.25	1.08	2.52	0.95
	Senior	2.38	0.97	2.45	1.09
	University College	2.16	0.86	2.34	1.10
	Engineering	2.31	0.81	3.00	1.55
	Arts and Sciences	2.35	1.21	2.67	1.14
	Business Administration	2.26	1.00	2.33	1.03
	Journalism	2.35	0.99	2.55	0.90
	Education	3.00	0.0	2.17	0.97
	Other	2.22	1.30	2.00	0.89
	Caucasian	2.23	0.92	2.46	1.05
	Black	1.80	0.79	2.06	1.12
	Other	3.00	1.48	1.50	0.71
Men	Overall	4.94	1.07	4.45	1.39
	Freshman	5.28	1.26	4.44	1.59
	Sophomore	4.74	1.05	4.59	1.44
	Junior	5.06	0.97	4.46	1.35
	Senior	4.67	0.96	4.45	1.07
	University College	4.98	1.23	4.47	1.54
	Engineering	4.71	1.04	5.00	1.09
	Arts and Sciences	5.04	0.88	4.81	1.11
	Business Administration	4.77	0.84	4.39	1.09
	Journalism	5.05	1.00	4.55	1.28
	Education	5.00	0.0	4.14	1.22
	Other	5.11	1.05	4.33	1.03
	Caucasian	4.93	1.08	4.38	1.34
	Black	5.20	1.03	4.97	1.49
	Other	4.73	0.90	5.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Soft-Hard - Continued

		Males		Females	
Section	Classification	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	2.54	1.20	2.44	1.39
	Freshman	2.79	1.50	2.42	1.49
	Sophomore	2.40	0.90	2.62	1.43
	Junior	2.54	1.24	2.21	1.14
	Senior	2.46	1.07	2.55	1.43
	University College	2.59	1.28	2.46	1.41
	Engineering	2.40	1.01	2.00	1.09
	Arts and Sciences	2.78	1.28	2.52	1.42
	Business Administration	2.19	0.87	2.11	1.13
	Journalism	2.60	1.35	2.77	1.56
	Education	2.00	0.0	2.28	1.36
	Other	2.67	1.32	1.83	0.75
	Caucasian	2.57	1.21	2.42	1.31
	Black	1.70	0.48	2.67	1.87
	Other	2.82	1.25	1.00	0.0
Men At Home	Overall	4.11	1.31	3.61	1.37
	Freshman	4.21	1.51	3.75	1.56
	Sophomore	4.02	1.44	3.68	1.51
	Junior	4.04	1.25	3.52	1.24
	Senior	4.18	1.17	3.50	1.16
	University College	4.03	1.47	3.74	1.51
	Engineering	4.45	1.09	4.00	0.0
	Arts and Sciences	4.00	1.26	3.48	1.31
	Business Administration	3.74	1.18	3.94	1.47
	Journalism	4.45	1.00	3.35	1.07
	Education	5.00	0.0	3.28	1.19
	Other	4.55	1.51	3.50	1.64
	Caucasian	4.09	1.29	3.52	1.28
	Black	4.80	1.48	4.15	1.80
	Other	4.09	1.51	3.50	0.71

Table 51 - Continued

Soft-Hard - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Work	Overall	3.88	1.34	3.55	1.33
	Freshman	3.77	1.41	3.63	1.54
	Sophomore	3.74	1.13	3.68	1.43
	Junior	3.96	1.47	3.32	1.16
	Senior	3.97	1.29	3.54	1.14
	University College	3.77	1.30	3.66	1.43
	Engineering	3.98	1.30	4.50	0.84
	Arts and Sciences	4.11	1.47	3.22	1.09
	Business Administration	3.74	1.32	3.67	0.91
	Journalism	3.95	1.43	3.25	1.33
	Education	5.00	0.0	3.34	1.20
	Other	3.89	1.54	3.67	1.03
	Caucasian	3.87	1.36	3.62	1.26
	Black	3.70	1.16	2.94	1.60
	Other	4.36	1.21	4.50	2.12
Men At Work	Overall	4.98	1.22	4.76	1.31
	Freshman	5.00	1.33	4.82	1.55
	Sophomore	5.05	1.25	4.94	1.41
	Junior	5.00	1.12	4.68	1.15
	Senior	4.90	1.21	4.65	1.09
	University College	5.00	1.27	4.88	1.41
	Engineering	5.02	1.14	4.83	0.75
	Arts and Sciences	4.87	1.32	4.85	1.43
	Business Administration	4.87	1.18	4.39	0.98
	Journalism	5.10	1.21	4.50	1.30
	Education	5.00	0.0	4.72	1.22
	Other	5.11	0.33	4.50	0.55
	Caucasian	4.96	1.22	4.79	1.23
	Black	5.50	1.08	4.51	1.80
	Other	4.82	1.17	5.00	1.41

Table 51 -- Continued

Unemotional-Emotional

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women	Overall	6.12	0.87	5.92	1.01
	Freshman	6.38	0.66	5.94	1.14
	Sophomore	6.19	0.76	6.00	0.98
	Junior	6.00	1.07	5.82	0.99
	Senior	6.02	0.82	5.93	0.90
	University College	6.26	0.70	5.97	1.08
	Engineering	5.95	1.01	6.50	0.84
	Arts and Sciences	6.07	0.86	5.74	0.90
	Business Administration	6.10	0.75	5.72	0.89
	Journalism	6.05	0.89	5.77	1.00
	Education	6.00	0.0	5.90	0.94
	Other	5.78	1.92	6.50	0.55
	Caucasian	6.14	0.87	5.92	0.98
	Black	6.10	0.74	5.85	1.23
	Other	5.73	1.01	6.00	1.41
Men	Overall	4.01	1.32	4.15	1.53
	Freshman	3.91	1.27	4.02	1.80
	Sophomore	3.77	1.25	4.59	1.50
	Junior	4.09	1.46	4.23	1.40
	Senior	4.13	1.26	4.03	1.29
	University College	3.94	1.32	4.21	1.67
	Engineering	4.09	1.27	2.83	1.17
	Arts and Sciences	4.18	1.40	3.93	1.49
	Business Administration	3.87	1.28	4.00	1.24
	Journalism	4.00	1.34	3.97	1.40
	Education	4.00	0.0	4.55	1.24
	Other	4.00	1.73	4.33	1.51
	Caucasian	4.06	1.29	4.22	1.47
	Black	3.10	0.99	3.64	1.83
	Other				

Table 51 - Continued

Unemotional-Emotional - Continued

Section	Classification	Males		Females	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Women At Home	Overall	5.75	1.18	5.75	1.22
	Freshman	5.79	1.25	5.74	1.31
	Sophomore	5.74	1.13	5.59	1.26
	Junior	5.83	1.16	5.93	1.06
	Senior	5.67	1.17	5.70	1.22
	University College	5.77	1.19	5.64	1.31
	Engineering	5.79	1.20	6.67	0.52
	Arts and Sciences	5.51	1.31	5.85	1.03
	Business Administration	5.90	0.94	5.94	0.87
	Journalism	5.65	1.14	5.65	1.39
	Education	7.00	0.0	5.76	1.09
	Other	6.22	0.83	6.33	0.52
	Caucasian	5.75	1.17	5.83	1.08
	Black	6.20	1.03	5.15	1.84
	Other	5.55	1.37	6.50	0.71
Men At Home	Overall	4.58	1.25	4.76	1.35
	Freshman	4.53	1.44	4.64	1.53
	Sophomore	4.47	1.32	4.79	1.49
	Junior	4.66	1.25	4.73	1.23
	Senior	4.59	1.09	4.88	1.16
	University College	4.53	1.35	4.67	1.43
	Engineering	4.45	1.27	4.33	1.97
	Arts and Sciences	4.64	1.25	4.81	1.47
	Business Administration	4.97	0.71	4.67	1.03
	Journalism	4.60	1.19	5.05	1.20
	Education	4.00	0.0	4.79	1.11
	Other	4.00	1.50	5.17	0.75
	Caucasian	4.59	1.25	4.86	1.30
	Black	4.10	1.29	4.03	1.53
	Other	4.64	1.29	5.00	0.0

Table 51 - Continued

Unemotional-Emotional - Continued

Section	Classification	Males Mean	Males SD	Females Mean	Females SD
Women At Work	Overall	4.35	1.33	4.35	1.42
	Freshman	4.30	1.32	4.18	1.74
	Sophomore	4.21	1.34	4.56	1.23
	Junior	4.49	1.38	4.70	1.14
	Senior	4.32	1.31	4.20	1.24
	University College	4.25	1.34	4.26	1.59
	Engineering	4.55	1.31	4.17	1.17
	Arts and Sciences	4.22	1.33	4.78	1.01
	Business Administration	4.10	1.33	4.28	1.13
	Journalism	4.80	1.44	4.30	1.34
	Education	5.00	0.0	4.38	1.18
	Other	4.89	1.17	5.50	0.55
	Caucasian	4.36	1.33	4.39	1.40
	Black	3.80	1.69	4.06	1.54
	Other	4.64	1.03	4.50	0.71
Men At Work	Overall	3.30	1.33	3.45	1.47
	Freshman	3.23	1.42	3.46	1.76
	Sophomore	3.30	1.46	3.24	1.39
	Junior	3.30	1.22	3.48	1.37
	Senior	3.36	1.31	3.53	1.23
	University College	3.23	1.39	3.47	1.66
	Engineering	3.76	1.28	2.50	0.84
	Arts and Sciences	3.24	1.35	3.81	1.47
	Business Administration	3.13	1.15	3.33	1.08
	Journalism	3.30	1.26	3.30	1.32
	Education	2.00	0.0	3.52	1.24
	Other	3.11	1.27	3.83	0.98
	Caucasian	3.33	1.32	3.44	1.43
	Black	2.90	1.60	3.48	1.77
	Other	3.18	1.25	3.50	2.12

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Barbara Bourne Rucker was born and reared in Montgomery, Alabama. She was married in 1961 to Lucien Maurice Rucker, III, and they have one child, Michael, who was born in 1970.

In May 1974 she received the Bachelor of Arts degree with honors in psychology from the University of Colorado. While an undergraduate, she was elected to Phi Beta Kappa national honorary fraternity and was also selected for Who's Who Among Students in American Universities and Colleges.

In September 1974 she entered the University of Florida as a graduate student in the Department of Counselor Education. While in that program she acted as the graduate assistant to the Department Chairperson. In August 1976 she received the Master of Education and Specialist in Education degrees in Counselor Education.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Larry C. Loesch

Larry C. Loesch, Chairperson
Associate Professor of Counselor Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Joe Wittmer

Joe Wittmer
Professor of Counselor Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Wilson H. Guertin
Professor of Educational Foundations

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Robert O. Stripling
Distinguished Service Professor
of Counselor Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Janet J. Larsen
Associate Professor of Counselor
Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Counselor Education in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

June 1979

Dean, Graduate School